SECTION 9 - JESUITICA

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Year
Vol. 72 - 1943

DATE | ISSUED TO

This book may be kept for one month. This is a free service; no fines are imposed.

We do invite the utmost cooperation to keep the books in constant circulation and to preserve their good condition.

Each book has an apostolic mission to spread the truths of God's goodness and the goodness of God's truth. You are its host for a month. You are its responsible custodian.

May You Enjoy This Book

JESUIT HALL
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, Mo. 63108

DEMCO

Date Due

THE
WOODSTOCK
LETTERS

VOL. LXXII NO. 2 JUNE, 1943

The Origins of
The Catholic Medical Mission Board
and
The Daughters of Mary, Health of the Sick

EDWARD F. GARESCHE, S.J.

The Editor of THE WOODSTOCK LETTERS has kindly asked me to review for these pages the origins of The Catholic Medical Mission Board and the devoted community of Sisters who labor now in this work, as well as the part which other Jesuits and myself were privileged to play in those origins. I shall write this, as a thanks offering to Divine Providence, and to the Blessed Mother for the privilege of having a place in a charity so dear to them. In fact, we have received so many signs of the special help of God that we are little inclined to take any special credit ourselves for any good that has been accomplished.

Some time ago when asked about the progress of the work, I said that it reminded me very much of the old saying about heaven. "When we get to heaven, three things will surprise us. First, the people who are there whom we did not expect to find there, second the people who are not there whom we did expect to meet, and third, how we got there ourselves!" Similarly I am surprised myself, in regard to this Medical Mis-

sion work, first, by the people who are interested in it whom we did not expect to be, second by those whom we expected to be interested but who aren't, and third how we got into it ourselves! To explain how I got into the medical mission work myself, I must be excused for reviewing a little personal history. After finishing Theology I was sent by Father Burroughes, then Provincial of the Missouri Province, to work on the staff of *America*, during the summer of 1913, expecting to go to the Tertianship immediately afterwards. But during the summer I received a letter from Father Burroughes saying that I must put aside the thought of going to the Tertianship that year, because Very Rev. Fr. General Wernz, according to a letter received from Father Elder Mullan, wished a Sodality magazine to be begun at once, and I was appointed to begin it. That summer in New York was a good immediate preparation. I had written articles and book reviews for *America* and now began to learn as much as I could both about Sodalities and publishing magazines. Father Michael O'Connell was the Editor of *America*, and I conferred with him, and also with Father Corbett and Brother Ramaz at the *Messenger*, and with Mr. R. J. Cudahy of the *Literary Digest*, and with some folk at *Colliers*, etc.

Reading the rules and something of the history of Sodalities I was struck by the great possibilities of that society of Our Lady to meet the needs of the day for zealous and apostolic men and women.

About the end of August I returned to St. Louis to confer with Father Burroughes, and with Father Garraghan, S.J., then his Socius, and their interest and suggestions were very helpful. One of our first problems, of course, was to choose a name which would express the purpose of the magazine. I wrote about and asked for suggestions, and one day we were discussing some of the replies received. One good Sister had sent in the name, "The Queen's Bugle," or "Our Lady's Bugle." This caused some merriment, as "Bugle" seemed a bit strong. But I remarked "We

might consider 'The Queen's Clarion'." That was pronounced not half bad.

But we wanted a name which would definitely express the idea that the Sodalists were to be stirred up and encouraged to *work* in honor of the Blessed Virgin. Someone asked, "why not take the name, 'The Queen's Work.?" This was debated a bit, the question arising whether readers would get the idea. But the further argument, that any name we took would in time come to have a meaning all its own,—carried the day. It was decided to call the new magazine *The Queen's Work.*

Then began the strenuous task of interesting those who could contribute articles, and those who could get subscriptions. I began a tour of the Province, visiting one community after the other, telling of the wish of Very Rev. Fr. General, of the purposes in view, and asking cooperation, seeking also the advice of the Directors of the Sodalities. Many of these latter were not very sanguine about the success of a Sodality magazine.

It was decided to try to get out the first issue in April, 1914, to be the May number, No. 1, Vol. 1. A scholastic, Mr. Ennis, was assigned as a helper in the business side, and Mr. Daniel A. Lord, about whose talent for writing I had heard a great deal, came to help with the editorial work, for one year. Mr. Lord was then just finishing his Juniorate, and I went out to Florissant to see him. He was convalescing from an illness, and I still have a vivid memory of his gratitude and joy at learning that he was going to be asked for as an assistant on *The Queen's Work,* as his strength would not have been up to teaching that year. So he came to help prepare the first number, and he was greatly helpful.

Sure enough, the May issue appeared in April, and met with a splendid reception. I remember Father O'Connor's message, which perhaps was typical of the reaction of many others, "you have started with a full-fledged Catholic magazine, which looks as though it

had been going or for years." Subscriptions came in gratifying numbers, and quite a number of Sodalities subscribed in groups. *The Queen's Work* had a great deal of Sodality material from the beginning. It was thought best to make it generally interesting as well. Nine books of Spiritual Reading, which I afterwards published were taken from its pages. So were two other volumes of "Sodality Conferences." Father Isaac Bosset, S.J., was assigned to be my editorial assistant and so was Father Wm. Kane, S.J. Father Hubert Brockman was appointed to help with business matters. A residence at 3224 Russell Avenue was bought as headquarters, with several acres of ground and a garage which was remodeled for a business office.

Then began eight years of promotion, organization, lecturing, writing and travels which gradually made *The Queen's Work*, its purpose, and the ideals of the Sodalities familiar from coast to coast.

During these years I came in contact with many hospitals, Sodalities for nurses and with many missionary activities, and these received interested mention in the pages of *The Queen's Work*.

In 1922, a letter came from Very Rev. Fr. General Ledechowski to Rev. Fr. Provincial saying that I was to come for my Tertianship to Europe, and might visit him in Rome on the way. On this first visit to Rome I had an audience also with His Holiness Benedict XV who showed great interest in the work we were doing both for the Sodality, and for the Catholic Young Men's Association.

I then had the happiness of making my Tertianship at Paray-le-Monial, an experience which could claim a volume for itself. The Lent was spent in England and Scotland, lecturing and preaching, a memorable experience.

After the Tertianship was over Very Rev. Fr. Ledechowski summoned me to Rome again, and when I presented myself at the Curia, then in the Collegio Germanico, his Paternity asked me—"Do you think you can organize a world-congress of Jesuit Sodality

Directors?" I replied that I was very willing to try, and so he explained that on the occasion of the Eucharistic Congress in Rome, to be held the following year, he wished to bring the leading Jesuit Directors of Sodalities to Rome to discuss plans for stimulating the work and spirit of Sodalities everywhere. Since, however, the preparations could hardly be made for six months or so, Father General gave me permission to visit the chief centers of Sodality work in Europe, and then to return to the United States and work there until it was time to start the preparations in Rome. I therefore came back to St. Louis, where I was appointed Director of Sodality work, and carried on the promotional activities until it was time to return to the Eternal City in the early spring.

Then Father General summoned from France Father de Bec Lievre, and from Germany a Father whose name I have forgotten. We worked together in great harmony at the German College for months preparing an outline of the more important features of Sodality work for discussion. The Congress was very interesting. Father General attended the sessions and took a leading part in the discussions. A Sodality paper for Jesuit Directors throughout the world was begun soon after, and much healthy stimulus was given to the Sodality idea.

Meanwhile the Fathers assembled were also able to attend the grand, even unique celebration of the Eucharistic Congress, whose midnight Mass for men in St. Peter's, said by the Holy Father, the newly crowned Pope Pius XI, and processions between St. Mary Major, the Coliseum and St. John Lateran, were unforgetable.

Returning to St. Louis, I was again made Director of Sodalities, and after some months was once more appointed editor of *The Queen's Work*. Meantime Father Aloysius Breen had been appointed business manger of *The Queen's Work*. I made new plans for the devolopment of the Sodalities, seeing prospects for a great expansion of their program, especially in

fields not already cultivated to any great extent, like the promotion of the study and reading of Catholic literature. I also wrote, at this time, the Sodality Manual. However Rev. Fr. McMenaimy, then Provinciial, said to me one day, "Father Moulinier, President of the Catholic Hospital Association, has urgently asked to have you help him, especially by editing their magazine *Hospital Progress*. He urgently needs your help. Father Lord will be available to carry on *The Queen's Work*, but I have no one but you for the editorship of *Hospital Progress*, as you are so familiar with hospitals and their work. So prepare to go to Milwaukee as soon as you can."

I had been in touch with the work of the Hospital Association, and had attended the Conventions, and been active for their interests, but it was of course a great wrench to leave *The Queen's Work* and the Sodality movement after so many years. Obedient to Father Provincial's wishes however, I went to Marquette University, Milwaukee, and took over the editorial direction of *Hospital Progress*, continuing to write and lecture, both on hospitals and other topics. At the request of Father Moulinier and the Board of Directors of the C. H. A., I also organized what was at first called the International Catholic Guild of Nurses, and directed its growth and activities for many years.

Meanwhile Dr. Paluel Flagg of New York had set on foot a committee of the Catholic Hospital Association called the Catholic Medical Mission Board, the result of his interest in the Medical side of the missions. I put a special department into *Hospital Progress* for medical mission promotion, as I had always taken an interest in the missions and had written of them in *The Queen's Work* and elsewhere. One day, when in New York, Dr. Flagg invited me to lunch and told me of his great difficulties in keeping the movement going. It then had its headquarters in a very small room adjoining his own office at Columbus Circle. Miss Dorothy Willman was his secretary for the work, but he said he could no longer carry on as Director and that

he felt a priest should take the lead. He asked me if I would take the work over. I had already told him that I was planning to do more for the medical missions in connection with *Hospital Progress*. Then I agreed to submit this request to my Provincial, then Father Mathew Germing, S.J. Meanwhile Rt. Rev. Joseph E. McGlinchey, formerly Archdiocesan Director of the Propagation of the Faith in Boston, spoke to me about the need for a priest to direct the work, and urged me to take it up in connection with my other activities. Father Germing, when I asked him about the matter, said I might do what I could for it in connection with my other work. Hence, I began to be active in its direction, preparatory to a convention that was to be held in New York to discuss the work and its development.

This meeting was held at the Sacred Heart College at Manhattanville, and was attended by many Provincials of communities with home and foreign missions. It was decided in the course of the deliberations to elect a Priest as Director. At this stage Msgr. McGlinchey took me aside and described to me attitudes and conditions that threatened the very existence of the organization, and urged me to allow myself to be proposed for Director. "If you do not," he said, "the whole thing will go to pieces. But if you do, everyone will see that it is to be a permanent work." Rev. Fr. Kelly was then Provincial of the Maryland-New York Province, and was present at the convention, following the discussions with great interest. I put the matter before him at once, and he immediately replied: "You had better do what Msgr. McGlinchey thinks best. He is very prudent, and knows the situation thoroughly." At the election for Director, therefore, my name was placed in nomination by Rev. Fr. Barron, C.SS.R., then provincial of the Redemptorists, and I was unanimously elected Director of the Catholic Medical Mission Board. Father Skelly, a young priest of the Brooklyn Diocese, was elected assistant director.

We at once rented a large office at 25 West Broad-

way in Manhattan, around the corner from Barclay Street. There we had about a thousand square feet of space, and there was begun the work of gathering and shipping medical supplies, which, in the years since then, had each year poured many tons of precious bandages, dressings, remedies, instruments and equipment into the dispensaries and hospitals of a thousand mission stations of a hundred different religious communities, all over the world, in our own and in all the mission lands. Thence also went press notices, letters, leaflets to spread the knowledge of the work. Miss Willman continued for a while to serve as secretary, until the Board voted to invite a community of Sisters to help the work. She then went to work for the Sodality movement, under Father Lord, and the services of the Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement were secured. A devoted group of these Sisters came to work at 25 West Broadway. They lived at the convent at St. Cecelia's Church, New York, and came every day by subway to keep the books, do secretarial work, and prepare the material for shipment.

Evidently a residence for the Sisters and a larger headquarters for the work were essential. Finally, the present headquarters were secured. I had eight real estate firms looking for a site which we could purchase. Father Barron had kindly given leave to Rev. John Lynch, C.SS.R., a veteran missionary in Puerto Rico, to help us, and I secured leave for him to collect in some parishes. The funds gained in this way, and by contributions obtained elsewhere, enabled us to make the first payment on the two houses at 8 and 10 West 17th Street, Manhattan, near enough to St. Xavier for the Sisters to go to Mass there when I was absent, and perhaps the most convenient location obtainable for such a headquarters because so near transportation and shipping. The houses needed many repairs, but by great efforts we had no. 10 almost ready for occupancy by the time our lease ran out at 25 W. Broadway, and by receiving a few weeks' extension

of time, we were able to move direct from there to 10 W. 17th Street, in May, 1929.

Meanwhile Father Provincial set me free from the work in Milwaukee, and allowed me to devote most of my time to the Catholic Medical Mission Board, and the direction of the National Catholic Federation of Nurses, and the International Committee of Catholic Federations of Nurses in Europe, which I had helped to found in 1933 and of which I am still Spiritual Director, though I resigned as Spiritual Director of the work in the United States some years ago. The origin and progress of this work in Europe deserves an article to itself. It was an unique and memorable experience. The three great conventions, at London in 1933, at Rome in 1935 and in London in 1937 was wonderfully successful and well attended.

As the work grew and opened up ever new horizons of service, and as letters and visits from missionary Bishops, Priests and Sisters and Brothers witnessed its immense fruitfulness, the thought grew that here was need for a new community of Sisters, whose members would devote themselves entirely to the work, both at the headquarters of the C. M. M. B. and in the mission fields, at home and abroad. It is true that Dr. Anna Dengel had in 1925 begun a community which she called the Catholic Medical Missionaries, (a title which caused, and still does cause great confusion because of its similarity to that of the Catholic Medical Mission Board whose name, however, long antedates the establishment of Dr. Dengel's community). But she had been asked to cooperate with the work of the Board, and had decided it would be better not to do so. Her community had also definitely decided to work only in the foreign fields. Other communities, asked about undertaking the work, were unable to assume the added responsibility.

As Msgr. Lavelle, of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, was an old friend, and knew much of our work, I asked him whether he thought His Eminence Card-

inal Hayes would like the idea of a new community to work for the Medical Missions, telling him that while I appreciated the services of the Sisters who were then helping us, I judged they would not be able to keep up the work, as they had so many commitments, and that we could not expect them to leave their Sisters permanently in the work, or to supply increasing numbers as they became necessary. He said he would ask His Eminence, and later reported to me that the Cardinal was in favor of the plan. I then spoke to Rev. Fr. Phillips, then Provincial, who kindly took the matter under advisement, communicated with Rev. Fr. Horine, then Provincial of the Missouri Province, and on hearing from him, wrote to put the matter before our Very Rev. Fr. General. His Paternity's answer was very encouraging. He approved of the idea, and of my working for it under direction of His Eminence Cardinal Hayes. Cardinal Fumasoni-Biondi also wrote his enthusiastic approval, and on June 10, 1935, I received an Indult from Cardinal Hayes, dated May 29 of the same year, authorizing me to erect a Diocesan Congregation of Religious Women under the title of Daughters of Mary, Health of the Sick. Then began the many activities necessary to set on foot the new institution. I wrote the first draft of the Constitution and Rules, which were added to and developed by direction of Msgr. Arthur J. Scanlan, whom the Cardinal had designated, and then approved by him.

The former estate of the landscape artist, George Inness, Jr., was purchased for the motherhouse and novitiate, and a Hospice of Rest was opened there, for the training and support of the Sisters. The late Holy Father, in one of several private audiences expressed his pleasure and approval of the Sisterhood and gave it a big blessing. He declared that Medical Mission work "is the work that Christ Himself chose, both to begin His ministry and to carry it forward." All this was accomplished, by the evident and special favor of Our Lord and His Blessed Mother, (whose favorite work of mercy we are promoting) during the days

from June 10, 1935 to June 15, 1936. The years between then and now have been crowded with events, some favorable, some at first sight discouraging, but which have all worked for good. The usual course of Divine Providence has guided the young institute. It has had its share of storms from without, which rose and were calmed with preternatural suddenness. Sometimes Jesus seemed to sleep, but the event proved that, as we always know, His Hand was directing all, and brought calm to the waves just when they seemed most threatening. So the work, both of the Catholic Medical Mission Board and of the Sisterhood goes forward day by day under the sure protection of Jesus, Mary and Joseph. We ask you, dear reader, to help us to give thanks to God, and also to pray for its continuous growth and greater and greater success.

(*Continued from the last issue*)

FATHER CHARLES NEALE, S.J.

and

The Jesuit Restoration In America

LAURENCE J. KELLY, S.J.

After the publication of the Bull in the United States Father Grassi was instructed by the General to reorganize the work of the Jesuits in the mission and establish community life. Archbishop Carroll feared that this might interfere with the missionary duties of the Fathers and perhaps cause their withdrawal from the Churches and stations. He therefore proposed to make a concordat with the Superior so as to clarify their mutual relations and prevent future misunderstandings. His plan was to assign permanently to the Jesuits certain definite missions or quasi-parishes. He and Bishop Neale had been members of the Select Body of Clergy that was now replaced by the corporate Society under its Superior. In a letter to Father Plowden the Archbishop said it was the intention of himself and the Bishop to effect the transfer of all the properties to the Society by limiting membership in the property-holding corporation to Jesuits only. With the cooperation of Father Grassi this was brought about (in 1816) without the least friction.

But the concordat proposed by Archbishop Carroll had not been executed when he died, Sunday, December 3, 1815. He was in his eighty-first year. Father Grassi gave this estimate of him: "To his courtesy of demeanour was joined a rare goodness of heart, qualities which won him the merited esteem and respect of the public, not only Catholic, but non-Catholic and most hostile to the name of Roman Catholic." Monsignor Guilday in his complete and splendid biography of the Archbishop emphasizes his goodness of heart as his outstanding virtue. He never lost faith in the conscientiousness of those with whom he had any diffi-

culty, especially if they were men, as he said to himself, "whose whole lives have been devoted to the service of religion and who, under trying conditions, have served it successfully." "Treachery and deception and other misunderstandings," to quote Guilday, "never seem to have chilled the natural tenderness of the man's heart or to have blighted the ecclesiastic's optimism."

It remained for Archbishop Neale, his coadjutor and successor in the See of Baltimore, to resume negotiations with Father Grassi. They signed the concordat April 3, 1816. By this agreement the Superior was empowered to delegate faculties to the Priests whom he assigned to churches and missions, and on him rested the responsibility of supplying priests to the stations listed, of which but a very few had ever been attended by non-Jesuits. The authority of the Superior in temporals was conceded since all the church properties except St. John's in Baltimore belonged to the Society. The concordat was a simple agreement regarding diocesan administration, and did not require ratification by the Pope or the General. It conformed to Church law and polity and had been observed before the war of the American Revolution when the Vicars Apostolic in England confided the entire administration of the Mission to the Jesuit Superior. Practically the same status quo had been maintained until Bishop Carroll, first as Prefect Apostolic and then as head of the diocese took complete charge of ecclesiastical affairs in the States.

By the Neale - Grassi concordat the Jesuits remained on all their missions in Maryland and so continued under succeeding Archbishops until near the close of the nineteenth century. They still retain all the parishes in St. Mary's County and one parish with its missions in Charles County. The pastoral residence has been transferred from St. Thomas Manor at Chapel Point to LaPlata, the County seat.

The concordat provided that should the Superior be unable at any time to supply priests, the matter

was to be adjusted with the Ordinary. Although Archbishops Carroll and Neale planned it as a permanent arrangement, Archbishop Marechal was later to reject it as invalid, for the reason that the Carrol - Molyneux concordat had been discarded as invalid.

Father Laurence Graessl, S.J., a singularly holy priest, had been Archbishop Carroll's first choice as his coadjutor with the right of succession. The Bulls confirming the choice were actually on their way from Rome when the good Father died in Philadelphia, a victim of the yellow fever. Father Leonard Neale was then chosen for the dignity with the concurrence of the clergy, and proposed to the Holy See. The choice was ratified by Rome, April 17, 1795, but it was not until December 7, 1800, that Bishop-elect Neale could be consecrated because of loss of letters and documents and long delays in transmission between Rome and Baltimore. Bishop Carroll was the Consecrator and it was the first ceremony of its kind in the United States. Bishop Neale was President of Georgetown College at the time of his election, serving as its fourth president. His immediate predecessor was Father Dubourg, S.J., who became Bishop of Louisiana in 1815.

Archbishop Neale succeeded the venerable Archbishop Carroll immediately. His term of office was short and his administration rather uneventful. He founded the first monastery of Visitation Nuns in America at Georgetown, the Indult for which he had obtained from the Holy See July 14, 1816. For a decade he had been Chaplain and director of the group of pious ladies who formed the first Visitation community. He spent his last days at the Monastery and died there June 18, 1817, and his remains are entombed in the Crypt of the monastery. Father Dzierozynski who was Superior of the American Jesuits during the ten years preceding the erection of the Mission into a Province in 1833, gave Archbishop Neale the principal credit for having saved the property of the Society during the critical years until 1814. He wrote to Father General that "the record of the

Neale family certainly deserved to find a place in the history of the universal Society." It must be admitted that Leonard Neale took a leading part in saving the properties from dissolution, first as one of the Trustees from 1787 and then after the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen was formed in 1793, of which he was a member most of the years until 1816. An indirect tribute was paid to the Neales by Father Mosely, one of the Jesuits from England who was stationed at the Missions on the Eastern shore of the Chesapeake. He had witnessed the staunch faith of the Catholics of Maryland and the sacrifices they made in spite of handicaps and persecution to procure a Catholic education for their sons and daughters. "I think," he said, "that these families . . . are the glory of our flocks; edifying, virtuous, good Christians and well instructed in the faith." Father Thomas Hughes, from whose historical volumes much of the material of this sketch is taken, wrote: "When the youth returned to Maryland from St. Omer or Bruges they maintained the prestige of culture which distinguished the Catholic body in the colony."

In 1817 Archbishop Neale had trouble with some refractory spirits in Charleston, S. C., which was then under the jurisdiction of Baltimore. He suspended the trouble-makers who were not first-offenders. They then made false representations to the Congregation de Propaganda Fide and the Archbishop was overruled. In order to place his case before the Roman Authorities he induced Father Grassi, the Superior, to go to Rome and represent him. Father Grassi had urgent business with the General so he presumed his permission and left July 3, 1817. Pius VII promptly reversed the decision that had been given in favor of the recalcitrants. It was an example of one-sided action on the part of Propaganda without hearing both sides of the dispute. Another memorable instance of the same will be given later in this sketch.

Father Grassi did not return to America but was retained by the General. Before leaving for Rome he

had appointed Father Neale as Vice-Superior until his return or until Father General should make a permanent appointment. Father Brzozowski's choice was Father Anthony Kohlmann who took office September 10, 1817. He had been sent to the Maryland Mission in 1805 and is worthy of more than a passing notice.

Father Kohlmann was born in Alsace, July 31, 1771, and was ordained at Friburg in 1786. He was first a Capuchin, when that Order was dispersed he joined the Fathers of the Sacred Heart. After this Society was merged with the Fathers of the Faith in 1799 he held many posts of responsibility in their Colleges. In 1801 he was associated with a famous Father Backers at Amsterdam, the same who guided young John Roothaan to the Society of Jesus. Father Kohlmann was in London in 1803 where he was Superior of a College. In that year he applied to Very Reverend Father Gruber for admission into the Society of Jesus but was not freed from his important duties until 1805. He stayed for a time with the Jesuits in London and finally entered the novitiate at Dunaburg, White Russia, June 21, 1805. After a year he sailed with Father Epinette from Hamburg and went to Georgetown College to teach philosophy.

Three other priests were sent by the General from Russia to Maryland at that time, Fathers Malevé, Henry and Malon. While yet a novice in his second year he was appointed Socius to Father Francis Neale, the Master of Novices, whom he ably assisted in that office. Reference has already been made to this in the account of the opening of the first novitiate. In New York he opened the first Catholic Academy for young men and was assisted by Father Benedict Fenwick and a small band of Scholastics. Though the beginnings and the prospect were most excellent, the Academy was finally closed for lack of Jesuit teachers; Father Kohlmann would engage no others. He left New York in 1815 and turned over the administration to Father Fenwick, until the arrival of Dr. Concanan's successor,

Bishop John Connelly, O.P. His abrupt departure may have been caused by a report that he was being proposed for the bishopric. On his return to Georgetown he was appointed Master of Novices.

Two years later he was appointed Superior and President of the College. With a gift of $14,000 from a Russian named Divoff who had entered the Society in 1812 he erected the Washington Seminary on F Street which was first proposed as a novitiate. However, it was used as a theologate until 1824. On August 15, 1820, Father Kohlmann assumed the presidency of the institution and began with a class of eight in dogmatic theology. The next year the Seminary began to receive day scholars for the classical course and had to depend on tuition charges for support. This did not meet with the approval of Very Reverend Father General, for as yet the Holy See had not granted a dispensation for this. Therefore from 1827 to 1848 the school on F Street was conducted by non-Jesuits. In the meantime Father General Roothaan obtained the desired dispensation from the Pope and the Jesuits took charge again. The name was changed from Washington Seminary to Washington College, and in 1857 the name Gonzaga College appeared. In 1871 classes opened in a school building on I (Eye) Street, west of North Capitol, adjoining St. Aloysius Church.

When the Roman College was restored to the Society by Pope Leo XII in 1825, Father Kohlmann was called to Rome and taught dogma for the next five years. For a number of years, most of the American Scholastics made their Theological Studies in the Eternal City. Father Kohlmann was held in the highest esteem by the Holy Father and was appointed to posts in the Roman Congregations. Pope Gregory XVI appointed him Qualificator of the Sacred Inquisition. Until his death in Rome in 1836 he never ceased to spend himself in labors for the Church and for souls. While in Rome he was able to render considerable assistance to the cause of his brethren in America.

Two months after the appointment of Father Kohl-

mann as Superior, on December 14, 1817, Father Ambrose Marechal, a Sulpician, was named Archbishop of Baltimore, in succession to Archbishop Neale.

When Bishop Carroll was in England in 1790, after his consecration, an opportunity was offered by which he could comply with the wish of Pope Pius VI expressed in the Bull of his appointment to the See of Baltimore, *viz.* that he should establish as soon as possible a Seminary for the education of his future clergy. He had founded Georgetown College the preceding year as a step in that direction, for he foresaw that recruits from England could no longer be expected. Georgetown could not begin as a Jesuit College, but the Bishop would have it follow the plan of classical and scientific courses formerly conducted in the Jesuit Colleges in Europe for the general student body. He expected vocations to the priesthood to be thereby developed. Now came the opportunity for a Seminary in America.

Father Nagot of the Sulpician Seminary in Paris conferred with Bishop Carroll in London and an agreement was reached. In July, 1791, Father Nagot and three other Sulpicians arrived in Baltimore with five students from Europe as a nucleus for the new St. Mary's Seminary. Between that year and 1805 progress was slow; only nine from the Seminary reached the priesthood, among them two Marylanders, Father William Matthews, later Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, and Ignatius Baker Brooke, from whom Father Neale by an exchange of properties had procured the site for the Carmelite Monastery in 1790. Brooke had been a Jesuit Scholastic at Liege. When the Society was suppressed he returned to America and married. When his wife died he entered St. Mary's Seminary, but he did not re-enter the Society.

In 1792 eight more Sulpicians came to America, fleeing the French Revolution. Among them was Father Ambrose Marechal who had just been ordained at Bordeau and had left the same day for the United States. He did not say his first Mass until he arrived

in Baltimore. Since, due to lack of students, the Seminary could not give employment to the newcomers, Bishop Carroll assigned them to missionary work. Father Marechal, after a brief charge in St. Mary's County, was sent in December, 1792, to the Mission at Bohemia, Cecil County, Maryland. He remained there seven years, receiving his support from the revenue of the farm. But he found the climate and labors too much for his health, so in 1799 he returned to Baltimore to teach in the Seminary. At the request of Bishop Carroll, the expenses of the professors at the Seminary were defrayed in large part by the ex-Jesuit Corporation. Revenues from the same farms in Bohemia were used for this purpose. Under Father Marechal's management the farm did not prosper and the Sulpicians resorted to selling timber and even some of the negroes. As this was contrary to the agreement with the Corporation, Father Beeston, a Jesuit who had entered the Society in Russia in 1788, was placed in charge of these properties.

At the beginning of the new century neither the Seminary nor Georgetown College were succeeding—the Seminary for lack of funds, the College for want of an adequate teaching staff. The Directors of the College arranged for a Conference with the Sulpicians to plan a better co-ordination of the two institutions and for their support. The College needed professors; the Seminary had begun to extend its work to preparatory courses, whereas it has been established for higher studies alone.

Bishop Neale, then president of the College, had endeavored to obtain a professor of Philosophy from Stonyhurst. He failed in this and Bishop Carroll now appointed Father Marechal to the post. He taught but one year and returned to the Seminary, expecting to bring the class with him, but they did not follow. The Corporation was charged with the support of the students which was derived from the revenue of the farm at Whitemarsh and it was their wish to keep the

Philosophy class at Georgetown and Theology at the Seminary.

In 1803 Father (later Bishop) Dubourg, with another Sulpician, Father Flaget, the future Bishop of Bardstown, began a new enterprise by opening St. Mary's College, in Baltimore. He had, prior to that, tried to start a preparatory Seminary in Havana. When it failed he brought a number of French and Spanish youths to Baltimore to try the adventure there. Bishop Carroll did not permit them to receive American aspirants in this Baltimore Preparatory Seminary because Georgetown College, as yet a Diocesan Institution, was taking care of such candidates for the priesthood; so this attempt also was abandoned. The two Fathers then founded St. Mary's College as a non-sectarian institution for lay students. This College was maintained by the Sulpicians until 1852 when it was succeeded by Loyola College, under the Jesuits.

In the year 1803 Father Emery, the Superior General of the Sulpicians, recalled most of his subjects to France because their special work was the training of ecclesiastical students, not the care of souls and the conduct of parishes and missions. Bishop Carroll, sorely in need of priests, appealed to Father Emery not to withdraw his men and to leave part of his flock without pastors. Besides, he needed them as teachers at Georgetown. But in Europe there were now bright hopes of establishing Seminaries that would provide the Sulpicians with plenty of the work proper to their Institute, so the Bishops' appeal was in vain.

Father Marechal was one of those who returned to Lyons at this time. There he came to know the Archbishop, Cardinal Fesch, and also Father Whitfield who was to succeed him in the See of Baltimore, a quarter of a century later.

After teaching in the Sulpician Seminaries in Lyons and other cities, Father Marechal returned to Baltimore in 1812. Archbishop Neale on his accession made him his Vicar-General. Later he proposed him to the Holy See for the See of Philadelphia, but he declined

the honor. Then the Archbishop asked for Father Marechal as his coadjutor and successor, when Bishop Cheverus, his first choice, declined to come from Boston and accept the post.

Rome approved of Father Mareschal and he was to have been consecrated as Coadjutor; but the death of Archbishop Neale intervened and he was consecrated as his successor, instead, by Cheverus. He occupied the See of Baltimore until his death in 1828 at the age of 64.

In his first report to Propaganda in 1818 after the visitation of the diocese Archbishop Marechal praised Georgetown College as a "magnificent institution," and expressed regret that Jesuit Superiors in Europe did not send eminent professors to staff it. In 1819 he presided at the Graduation Exercises and distributed the diplomas and premiums. He referred to the recovery by the Society of all the estates and properties that had been possessed by the Jesuits before the Suppression of the Order. On May 13, 1821, he consecrated the cathedral in Baltimore which had just been completed.

On taking up his duties at the Cathedral, Archbishop Marechal found in the files of Archbishop Carroll the original draft of the agreement between that Archbishop and Father Molyneux, dated September 20, 1805, and containing deletions and corrections though signed by both parties. Long years after Marechal's time this original was found in the Diocesan archives in Baltimore. Archbishop Marechal at once decided that this document was valid and binding, and made a corrected and finished copy of it to use for his own purposes.

The Archbishop used this document first to claim jurisdiction over the Jesuits although, since they had been restored in the intervening years by the Bull of Pius VIII, there could no longer be any doubt about their exemption. Moreover, on the strength of the same agreement he began to claim that the Society's property had devolved upon the Archdiocese and

should in justice be applied to the support of himself and the diocesan clergy. At the very least, he insisted, enough of the property held by the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen should be turned over to him to yield him, as head of the Archdiocese, an annual pension of $1200, since this sum had been paid annually to his predecessors.

It was not until a year after Father Kohlmann had been made Superior and had been authorized by the Corporation to act in all matters as its agent, that Bishop Marechal called him to a conference. He produced the original document and made a formal claim to the Jesuit properties as stated. Father Kohlmann examined the document and pronounced it entirely worthless because of the mutilations and because, though signed, it was neither sealed nor witnessed. Moreover, when the matter was later brought to Rome, the General, Father Fortis, declared that Father Molyneux had no authority from the General to make such a contract nor had it been ratified at any subsequent time by the General on the Society's side, nor by the Sovereign Pontiff on the Bishop's side. Besides, it had never been produced by Carroll as an authentic document. In closing the conference Father Kohlmann represented to Archbishop Marechal the injustice of depriving the Jesuits of revenue absolutely necessary for their support in order that thereby the Catholics of Baltimore might be relieved of their duty in conscience to support their Archbishop and his cathedral.

At this point a word will be timely to explain by what title the Jesuits possessed and administered their properties during the century and a half before the Suppression. At the time of colonization of Maryland they legally acquired certain estates or domains by grant under the royal charter or by gift of the Indians or by purchase, both for their own support and for their work among the people. They generously used for the poor and for the advancement of religion what they did not need for their own sustenance. As the Society was not recognized in a corporate way un-

der the laws of England which were in force in the colony, the General of the Society obtained from the Apostolic See canonical proprietary rights and title to hold their properties not as ecclesiastical in the canonical sense but as Society properties, exclusive of all interposition or supervision from Ordinaries of whatsoever kind—*quorumcumque Ordinariorum.*

Such was the ultimate and juridical basis of the Jesuit tenure of property, as is clear from the Bull of Pope Paul III, 1549, quoted by Father Hughes. Father Kohlmann admitted in principle that at the Suppression the title to the property should have been vested in the Pope for whom the General, Provincials and other Superiors administered it in the name of the professed Society.

But in the United States such a title would not have been recognized as valid by the Government and the properties would have been forfeited. There was but one course to follow. This was to have the individual ex-Jesuits continue to hold title so that, if the Society should be restored, the holders could convey the properties back to the Society. This, as we have seen, was duly accomplished and in legal form through the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen. An analogous case might be that by which the Knights of Columbus acquire and hold property. The national Order may not do so; it is not incorporated. But legal corporations are formed in the different States consisting exclusively of members of organized Councils who invest their own money in property needed for the purpose of the Order. These corporations hold title and conduct all the usual legal business connected with administration.

Father Hughes sums up the situation in America after the Society's suppression as follows: "The priests, recently members of the Order, remained on the ground. They were called ex-Jesuits. Being unsettled and dislodged from their membership in the Order, they should have to be ignored in great part by an historian of the Order during a period of cor-

porate exstinction, were it not that they happened to claim recognition, both individually and as a body under the aspect of a certain temporary organization which was precisely a Property-holding Incorporation; by means of which they preserved the ancient estates and restored them to the Society at its own restoration." Father Hughes, apropos of this observation, calls attention to a certain decision of the Holy See, dated September 23, 1836, to the effect that although the Society was suppressed historically (*de facto*) from 1773 until 1814, nevertheless it did not lose its legal and canonical (*de jure*) existence. Therefore it did not lose its right to its properties; and this seems to be confirmed by the fact that the Holy See began to order their return, wherever possible and where not confiscated by civil governments, immediately after the restoration. The Society's right to them was expressly stated in the Bull of Pius VII, *"Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum."*

Father Kohlmann, however, out of respect for Archbishop Marechal and because he had to incur the expense in completing the Cathedral, called a meeting of the Corporation at St. Thomas Manor, June 10, 1818, and it was voted to pay him $560 annually for the next three years on condition that he accept it as a gratuitous gift, not as an admission of his claim to a perpetual pension for himself and his successors. He accepted the donation and took no exception to the condition attached.

Father Kohlmann was now Superior and simply exercised his canonical rights when disposing of his subjects in the manner of exempt regulars. He was most careful to observe the courtesies and conditions required in dealing with Ordinaries in such cases; nevertheless, the Archbishop continued to dispute his right. Thus, in 1820, when the Superior wished to take Father Enoch Fenwick from the Cathedral in Baltimore and appoint him procurator of the Mission, the Archbishop would not hear of it. A replacement for Father Fenwick was offered but the Archbishop

would not acquiesce to any change. Finally the latter decided to take the matter up with Rome, in addition to the question of the right of the Jesuits to their properties. Thus began the long controversy in which Father Neale was again to become a doughty defender of the rights of the Society.

The Archbishop addressed a long memorial on August 19, 1820, to Cardinal Fesch, his personal friend whom he had known as Archbishop of Lyons. The Cardinal was now a member of the Congregation of the Propaganda, of which Cardinal Fontana was Prefect. In this Memorial Marechal included, as basis for his claims, a copy of the Carrol-Molyneux agreement of 1805 and a copy of the Regulations adopted in 1810 by Archbishop Carroll and his suffragans; and in conclusion he demanded specifically that the property at Whitemarsh in Prince George's County, Maryland, be delivered to him, alleging—without, however, adducing any proof— that the estate was a bequest for the general benefit of the Church in his diocese.

For nearly ten years the controversy waged back and forth between the Archbishop and Propaganda on one side and on the other Father Fortis, the General, backed by Fathers Grassi and Kenny in Rome and Fathers Kohlmann, Neale and the other Jesuits in Maryland.

Father Neale came into the dispute at its height. He was named Superior for the third time by Father Fortis on November 15, 1821, to succeed Father Kohlmann. He held that office until his death less than two years later, but he was the proper person to meet the crisis. For he was the only one living who knew the entire series of facts and negotiations between the Jesuits and the Ordinaries, from the granting of the Articles of Incorporation by the Maryland Legislature, December 23, 1792, down to the time in question. Probably to him even more than to his brother, the Archbishop, should be given the greater credit, under Providence, for saving the property of the Society.

The Marechal Memorial had not reached Rome when the General sent Father Peter Kenney from Ireland to Maryland as Visitor, chiefly to adjust the temporalities of the Mission and probably also to examine into the claims that were being made by the Archbishop. He arrived at Georgetown September 15, 1819. The Visitor was an eloquent preacher and an administrator of unusual ability and had been more than once Superior of the Jesuits in Ireland. He made a distinct impression on Americans and created a most favorable judgment of the Church and the Society, especially among non-Catholics. He made a thorough investigation of the case and came to the same conclusions as Father Kohlmann, that the claims of the Archbishop had no foundation either in truth or in justice.

Father Kenney had a conference with Marechal and declared that the so-called synodal decree or rule of discipline made by the Bishops in 1810, and on which the Archbishop based his claims to independent jurisdiction over the Jesuits was destructive of the essential rights of the Society as an Order of Exempt Regulars, much more so since the promulgation of the Bull of restoration. He did not allege any special privilege of the Society for this. Consequently, with his approval Father Kohlmann made some changes among the Fathers, always observing meticulously the formalities required by Benedict XIV. The Archbishop objected, but Father Kohlmann was firm, and in justification of his action he gave much the same reasons which had been put forward by Father Kenney. He maintained in the first place that the regulation of the Bishops claiming jurisdiction was not made in a synod; it was not in the form of a synodal statute; it enacted nothing, as statutes always do, but only expressed the opinion of the Bishops. Moreover, even if it had been a synodal decree, said Father Kenney, it would not now be binding on the Society, an Exempt Order. Its effect would be to release a Religious from his vow of obedience; it would give a Religious two

independent Superiors, his Provincial and the Bishop; it would restrain and prevent a Superior in some cases from protecting the souls of his subjects; finally it would discourage others from embracing the religious life and would contravene the legislation of Pope Benedict XIV.

After a year in America Father Kenney went to Rome to report to Father General. It was said that he made a hurried departure because he learned that Archbishop Marechal, notwithstanding their differences, had proposed him for the See of Philadelphia. Ten years later he was to return as Visitor and Superior to organize the Mission into a Province, and in February, 1833, he installed Father William McSherry as the first Provincial.

Archbishop Marechal did not reply to Father Kenney or Father Kohlmann. As was said before, he took his case directly to Rome in a Memorial to Propaganda, August 19, 1820. It contained two principal claims, to jurisdiction over the Jesuits and to their property. He gave three reasons for his second claim, *viz.*, that the properties had been given to the Church, not to the Society; that his predecessors, Archbishops Carroll and Neale had received pensions from the revenues of the properties in their official capacity as Ordinaries and rulers of the Archdiocese, and thirdly, that the act of the Maryland Legislature had incorporated not the Jesuit Clergy but the Roman Catholic Clergy. To this third argument the Jesuits replied that the only clergy who could possibly be intended at the time of incorporation were ex-Jesuits, holding the Society's properties, first as individuals and then as a Corporation, until the Society could recover them if and when reestablished in America. The other reasons alleged for the Archbishop's claim will be refuted as we proceed.

The Congregation of Propaganda sent the memorial to Father Fortis, the General, who on receiving it (February 3, 1821) wrote to the Superior, Father Kohlmann. He assured him that although the special

privileges formerly possessed by the Society had not been restored by the Bull of Pius in 1814, there could be no doubt whatever about the privilege of exemption, for now the Jesuits enjoyed it in common with all Regulars. Beyond that the Superior was not to claim any privileges other than those which were certainly essential and common to all Religious Orders. We note in passing that it was not until 1826 that Pope Leo XII, the successor of Pius VII, began to restore the Society's ancient special privileges.

The General's reply to the Memorial was sent to Propaganda February 4, 1821; and two weeks later he sent a supplementary statement, touching again upon both claims of the Marechal Memorial.

When the Archbishop of Baltimore received from Propaganda the General's replies to the Memorial and its claims, he decided to go and plead his case in person. On October 15, 1821, suddenly and without a word to anyone he set out for Rome. Before and during his visit and after his return to America, he was aided and represented at discussions and hearings before Propaganda by Doctor Robert Gradwell, Rector of the English College in Rome, who was unfriendly to the Jesuits both in his own country and in the United States. The Archbishop formally presented his claims to the General, January 18, 1822. Two days later he received the General's reply. Father Rozaven, the Assistant for Italy, prepared it and most of the General's answers. He was assisted by Fathers Kenney and Grassi who were in Rome, and by Father Kohlmann who had left America a month after the Archbishop, leaving Father Neale in charge. The Archbishop had appointed Father Kohlmann Vicar General for six of the counties of Maryland in his absence; but he did not accept the appointment, nor did the General approve of it.

One week after receiving the answer of the General, the Archbishop returned with another document which was a repetition of the Memorial, rather than a reply to the General's rebuttal. Again, on February

4, 1822, the General submitted a long and more detailed refutation of the Archbishop's claims and arguments. It caused his Grace keen disappointment and almost made him despair of ever reaching a peaceful solution in which his side of the dispute would be accepted.

In Father General's report to Propaganda, in May, 1822, on Marechal's claim to jurisdiction over the Jesuits, he appealed to the legislation of the Council of Trent and Benedict XIV according to which superiors in America, when disposing of their subjects to the best interests of the Order, simply acted within their canonical rights. Whatever may have been the status of the Jesuits prior to 1814, their exemption, he said, was now established beyond all question and cavil by Pius VII in the Bull of Restoration. We remark here that the exemption of Regulars from the jurisdiction of Bishops was always jealously guarded by the Holy See. In this very Bull of Pius VII they are called "the splendor and pillar of religion and the Catholic Church," whose subordination to the one Ordinary, the Supreme Pontiff, exempts them from that disunion and division which would result from their subjection to many diocesan Ordinaries. This attitude of the Holy See was further demonstrated by the Fathers of the Vatican Council. We quote their words: "We should not pass over in silence the fact that some otherwise worthy men, deceived by apparently good motives, have risen up and opposed the exemption of Regulars. They fail to understand that this has been their right from the earliest times; that the Apostolic See has declared how useful and necessary is this exemption; that to deprive Religious Orders of the same would destroy all their autonomy, unity and power for good, and would reduce them to the level of diocesan societies without connection or uniformity."

Following the representation of Father Fortis the Congregation of Propaganda on June 3 passed a decree which was communicated to the General on July 27. It implicitly admitted the canonical exemption

claimed by the General, and merely insisted that no missionaries be removed without previous notification to the Ordinary, and that substitution be made by the Superiors to fill the places of those withdrawn.

A copy of this decree was sent by the General to Father Neale, and presumably one was communicated to Archbishop Marechal by Propaganda. Nevertheless, in 1825, Father Dzierozynski had to complain to the General that he was not free to dispose of his men because of the Archbishop's extreme interpretation of this latest decree of Propaganda. In such trying circumstances the Superior must have sympathized with his predecessor, Father Neale, who was similarly hampered while conforming strictly to the conditions laid down by Propaganda and the legislation of the Holy See.

The General now went directly to Pope Leo XII, who had been elected in 1823 to succeed Pius VII. He asked His Holiness if the simple decree of Propaganda of June 3, 1821, had the effect of abrogation or suspension of the laws of the Church on canonical exemption.

The Pope's Brief of July 11, 1826, was probably meant to be, in part, a reply to the General's appeal. By it His Holiness restored many of the Society's former special privileges. We quote: "After considering the request of the members of the Society for the privileges and faculties obtained by the grants of our predecessors Paul III and Julius III and grants made by Pius V, Gregory XIII and Urban VIII we have decided that those faculties should be added which were granted by decrees of the Council of Trent and later by the several Constitutions of our predecessors and which it seems proper now to renew because of the necessity of the times and the discipline of the Roman Church." Then follows a list of some forty specific faculties or privileges in two series.

The appeal of Father Fortis to Leo XII put an end to all further claims of jurisdiction by Ordinaries over the Jesuits. Finally, Pope Leo XIII by a special decree, *Dolemus Inter*, July 13, 1886, after expressing

great affection for the Society and praising its worth and service in the Church and its devotion to the Holy See, granted all the privileges conceded to other Orders since the restoration of the Society, and added: "To give further expression of our good will for the Society of Jesus, we renew and confirm by this letter and our apostolic authority all and every one of those apostolic letters regarding the erection, founding and confirmation of the Society granted by Our Predecessors."

We turn now to the details of Father Fortis' rejoinder to the Archbishop's second claim, that ownership of the Jesuits' properties was really invested in him. In the first place, the General maintained, documentary proof showed that, from the days of the colonization of Maryland, gifts and bequests had been made to the Jesuits either corporately or individually. The use and revenue of such properties was to be devoted to their personal needs, or for the extension of their missionary work, or for the charitable support of poor folk who were persecuted and penalized because of their Catholic religion and were dispossessed or taxed almost out of existence. The situation of the Jesuits in England and Ireland was similar, before and after the Suppression. They held their property independently of the Vicars Apostolic and applied it to those purposes for which it was given to the Society, educational or otherwise. They contended that they had no power to alienate it to any other purpose. Like the Americans, they passed it down from one to another of the ex-Jesuits, hoping confidently that it would again become the property of the restored Society.

Secondly, Father Carroll, when Prefect Apostolic, had reported, March 1, 1785, to Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect of the Propaganda, that there was no strictly ecclesiastical property, but only the Society's property held by individual ex-Jesuits and passed from one another in expectation of the restoration of the Society. When non-Jesuits came to labor in the Mission,

the Fathers agreed to let them benefit by the revenue from the properties. Carroll himself, with four other ex-Jesuits signed an address to other members of the Select Clergy in February, 1787, in which it was declared that it would never be in the power of the future Bishop to frustrate the eventual recovery by the Society of its property, "particularly as he is secluded from all share of government in temporal affairs."

Thirdly, the purpose of the Select Body of Clergy, as expressed in the 16th article of its Constitution, adopted in 1793, was expressly to conserve the Jesuit properties until they could be returned when the Society should be fully restored if such restoration should come to pass. The members of the Corporation bound themselves by oath on taking office to execute that trust. Both Bishop Carroll and Bishop Neale took that oath when members of the Corporation.

Fourthly, when Carroll was named first Bishop of Baltimore and received the Bull from Pius VI, in order to dispel all misunderstanding he wrote a declaration in his own hand and signed it, May 26, 1790. This was to the effect that while the Bull gave him authority to administer the ecclesiastical revenues of the diocese it gave him, as Ordinary, no right to or over the property of the Society held by the ex-Jesuits in trust and shared with non-Jesuits in the Mission. Marechal alleged that Carroll was forced to sign this declaimer by an angry, violent Jesuit, who never reentered the Society.

Fifthly, in the projected but unexecuted concordat with the Superior, Father Molyneux, in 1805, Bishop Carroll clearly recognized the properties as belonging to the Society. Sixthly, in the authentic minutes of the Corporation's proceedings, it is recorded that Archbishop Neale expressly denied that, as Ordinary, he had any right to the properties or their revenue.

Further reasons of no little weight against Marechal's claim could be added. When the two ex-Jesuit Bishops appealed to the General, Father Gruber, for the restoration of the Society in the United States,

they gave the assurance that the revenue from the Jesuit properties was sufficient to support thirty members. Finally, in the last year of his life, on February 21, 1815, Archbishop Carroll had referred to the properties as belonging to the Society and as having been restored to it by the Bull of Pius VII at the general restoration. At that time, by order of the Holy See, the Society's property was being returned wherever possible.

Even when Archbishop Marechal finally reduced his claim to an annual pension for himself personally, the General continued, the same could not be allowed. For his predecessors had a right to the pension in natural equity. They had been Jesuits, and the Bull of Suppression made provision for the support of former members of the Order from its properties. Besides they were active members of the Body of Select Clergy, and under the act of incorporation they were expressly entitled to this support. When Father Carroll succeeded Father Lewis as Superior of the ex-Jesuits in spirituals he was granted the same pension, and this was increased by vote of the clergy when Carroll became Bishop because of the extra expense he would have to incur. He ceased to be Superior of the ex-Jesuits in 1805, but the Committee of Representatives voted to continue the pension during his lifetime. Moreover he was a member of the Corporation at the time. Bishop Neale until his death in 1817 stood in practically the same relation as Carroll to the Jesuit Body of Clergy and the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen; but Bishop Marechal could make none of these claims.

When the Archbishop received this reply of the Father General he made some notes on it and sent it with a brief letter to Propaganda. He referred again to his Memorial of 1820 as if the General's answer had not touched it, and he begged the Cardinals to speedily grant his request as he was eager to return to his diocese. He then reduced his claims to one, viz. legal title from the Jesuit Corporation to the farm at

Whitemarsh, insisting that the same was due him in justice.

In April, 1822, Archbishop Marechal continued to memorialize the Propaganda Cardinals. He reviewed the development of Catholic missions in Maryland from the earliest times and he put his own construction on the acts of the Bishops, the Legislature and the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen. He even returned to his claim of jurisdiction over the Jesuits. He told the Cardinals that the only alternatives left him were either to resign his See or bring suit before the civil courts to recover the property he still claimed belonged to him, in which case, he said, the Society must cease to exist in Maryland. He concluded by asking again that Whitemarsh be ceded to him. Apropos of this threatened suit it may be noted that the Corporation had filed a counter suit to recover a property held by an executor of the will of Archbishop Carroll, the said executor claiming that the revenue from the property had been part of Carroll's pension. And the court affirmed the Corporation's right to a return of the property.

The next move was made by Very Reverend Father General. He agreed on May 10 to a proposal by Propaganda that a Committee of three Cardinals arbitrate the dispute about the property; we hear no more about jurisdiction. But he put down certain conditions on which alone, he said, a just agreement could be founded, viz. that there be no implication that the title of the Society to the properties was ever in any way dubious or unjust; that if a contribution was to be made to the Archbishop, it must be understood as a matter of propriety, like contributions of other Catholics; moreover the Archbishop must sign a waiver or disclaimer to any other of the Corporation's property than Whitemarsh and thus preclude all future claims of Archbishops or dioscesan clergy; finally, that no assessment of contribution or grant of claim be allowed until authentic information be procured by Propaganda showing the ability of the

Jesuits to yield their right, since their means were not what the Archbishop had represented. The Archbishop had returned to his demand for a farm, Whitemarsh or its equivalent. But the General as the head of a mendicant order could not give it validly, as he was only the administrator of the Holy See, or licitly until he knew the resources of the American Jesuits, and these he did not know. If the pope commanded it, the General maintained that the Jesuits still had the natural right to present their side and make known if it were possible to do what he commanded.

In the same month of May 1822, for the further information of the proposed arbitration Committee of Cardinals, Father Fortis sent to Propaganda a critique of the Archbishop's ultimatum with its threat of a lawsuit. It was prepared by Father Rozaven and showed the patent contradictions in the statements of the Archbishop. It insisted that the Cardinals must first learn whether the American Jesuits could possibly meet the Archbishop's demands and asked how the Trustees or Corporation could escape the law if they violated their oath and delivered the Corporation's property to the Archbishop.

On June 18, Cardinal Fesch, one of the special committee, sent the General a draft of a proposed Concordat to be made between him and Marechal, by which the General was to make an absolute grant or gift of the Whitemarsh property to the Archbishop as his right, implying that the Jesuits were aggressors and unjust possessors. Marechal on his part would bind himself and his successors never to disturb the Jesuits in the possession of the rest of their property. If afterwards the General could show cause why the Archbishop should return the farm in question, the Congregation would reconsider the case; but in the event of the property being returned to the Jesuits they would be required to make over an equivalent one to the Archbishop.

Father Fortis instantly demurred. The conditions he had insisted upon had not been fulfilled, in that

the proposed Concordat represented the Archbishop's right to the property as a matter of justice and implied that the Jesuits were "invaders of archiepiscopal property." It regarded the General as the owner, but he was neither the owner nor did he know the value of the property; it called for the immediate delivery of the farm at Whitemarsh to the Archbishop without allowing the Jesuits to fully represent their side of the case until they had been dispossessed. It required the General to impose a precept of obedience on the American Jesuits to submit to the demands of the Archbishop, which, under the circumstances, he could not do in conscience. The Concordat was therefore abandoned but Propaganda incorporated its substance in a Brief, dated July 23, 1822, to be submitted to the Pope for his signature and the General was to be obliged in virtue of holy obedience to have it executed. He sent it to Father Neale, but after that he was unwilling to have anything more to do with the case. He believed that as the property was held by a legal corporation and by a title subject to the laws of Maryland it was a matter to be decided between the Archbishop and the Corporation by the civil courts.

But as neither the Brief nor the proposed Concordat fulfilled the very reasonable conditions laid down by the General as essential to a peaceful conclusion of the controversy, there was to be no peace.

Archbishop Marechal returned to America November 21, 1822, bringing the Brief and a personal letter from the General to Father Neale. He also brought a more formal letter which Father Neale was to communicate to all the Jesuits enjoining by a precept of obedience the execution of the Brief, so that the General as far as he could do so might deliver the Whitemarsh property to the Archbishop. On November 27, Marechal sent to Father Neale at Port Tobacco the Papal Brief and the two letters and the Decree of Propaganda regarding jurisdiction or the relations of the Superior and Ordinary in the assignment of priests to pastoral duties. In a letter of his own, the Arch-

bishop requested the Superior to answer whether he intended to submit to the Brief.

Again we find Father Neale in opposition to the Ordinary. He was surprised and shocked at the turn matters had taken in Rome against the Society. He well knew that although Fathers Kenney and Grassi and Kohlmann were in Rome to advise Father General in the case before Propaganda (and very ably had they done so) that advice was not heeded and their information was not accepted about the critical financial condition of the mission and the impossibility of sacrificing the property at Whitemarsh, which was the main support of the novitiate which occupied the property and of the scholasticate at Georgetown. Father Kenney had sent six theologians to Rome not only because of lack of professors but because of the poverty of the mission. The expenses of these theologians were supposed to be paid from the revenue of properties in Pennsylvania, but the greater part of the burden had to be borne by the Roman Province and the English Jesuits. Father Neale considered the decision of Propaganda expressed by the Brief as one sided; that the Society's true and complete side could not have been heard and understood by the Cardinals or the Pope.* Father General had contended as much. Matters financial in the mission were even worse than Father Kohlmann and the others really knew, and could not be known in Rome until he as Superior could present documentary proof and the testimony of the Procurator of the mission. He therefore protested against the immediate execution of the Brief. In this he was perfectly right and was supported by an explicit Constitution of Pope Benedict XIV regarding such disputes. That Pontiff had ruled that as the Pope may be deceived by ex parte and false statements, or by the suppression of facts which would

* In fact there is a letter of Archbishop Marechal to Father Grassi in which he admitted that neither the Pope nor the Cardinals knew the facts in the case or the implications of the Brief of July 27, 1822, on the immediate execution of which the Archbishop was insisting.

have prevented the papal consent to a decree or Brief, he granted not only to Bishops but to anyone whomsoever, the right to appeal from an adverse decree or decision of the Holy See when damage would be inflicted unless both sides of the case were heard; for the Holy See could never intend to countenance injustice. Neither by natural equity nor by just civil law would a one-sided judgment be accepted that would inflict injury on one of the parties. The injury that the Brief in question was sure to inflict on the body of American Jesuits was so grave that by a ruling of Pope Gregory XV it should have been brought directly and personally to Pius VII for a valid enactment. But this had not been done.

Father Neale, therefore, wrote to the Archbishop on December 9, 1822, in what he called an unofficial letter, giving particular reasons why the execution of the Brief should be delayed, reasons which had not been presented in Rome. The prelate replied immediately, reminding him of his vow of obedience and intimating that a lawsuit would be filed to acquire possession unless it were granted within the next thirty days.

Father Neale and Father Benedict Fenwick then sent a joint memorial to Father General, accompanied by documentary proofs supporting the Society's side of the case. They asked his Paternity to appeal to the Pope, alleging that the Brief had been issued without their knowledge and without giving the American Jesuits a hearing so as to make known the present actual condition of the mission. Father Neale informed the Archbishop that an appeal was being taken to the Holy See. Father General supported Father Neale in his protest against the one-sided decision, especially as the Brief was based on false evidence. The corporation, too, approved the action of the Superior, and Father Kohlmann in Rome gave Father General further and fuller information about conditions in Maryland. He stressed the fact that the properties were not diocesan and that therefore they had not been placed under Bishop Carroll's administration by

the Bull of Pius VI when he created the See of Baltimore. This, he said, had been conceded by the Bishop in a positive and signed declaration. Reference to this has already been made.

Father Dzierozynski who was to follow Father Neale as the last Superior of the Maryland Mission was at Georgetown College at the time. He also sided with Father Neale in opposing the immediate execution of the Brief and he wrote to Father General: "Our Reverend Superior who though very weak in body (every day he says Mass, receiving by way of Viaticum) is yet strong in soul and intrepid, has answered [the Archbishop] splendidly, point by point."

So the Brief was not executed and the Archbishop turned again to Propaganda, annotating the points made by Father Neale in his "unofficial" letter of protest. He went so far as to suggest that the Jesuits be secularized and placed under his jurisdiction individually if they did not submit. It was at this point that the Jesuits themselves began to think of going to Bishop Dubourg in Missouri. However, no further action was taken in Rome to sustain his claim to the Whitemarsh property.

Marechal then began to complain that the Brief had been made public by the Jesuits to discredit him. Through Father Kohlmann they denied all responsibility, for the Brief became known in Baltimore immediately on the Archbishop's arrival from Rome and before Father Neale himself could have received a copy of it. Father Kohlmann also stated that there would be public indignation if an attempt were made to compel the Corporation to surrender the property. As a threat had been made by the Archbishop that he would bring suit to recover it, some of the Trustees, or members of the Corporation proceeded to procure from the State files certified copies of the Articles of Incorporation and other papers to send to Rome in support of their cause. Of this also His Grace complained, and tried to get the names of anyone who had applied to the State authorities for such papers.

Father Neale did not survive to see the end of the long controversy. He died at Port Tobacco April 27, 1823, assisted in his last moments by Father Fenwick, the future Bishop of Boston and successor to Bishop Cheverus. After Father Neale's death his brother, Father Francis, was named vice-superior and served until Father Francis Dzierozynski was appointed by the General on August 13, 1823. The new Superior wrote of Father Neale to his Paternity: "He was a man of no ordinary talent, prudence and constancy and was the last remnant (in America) of the old Society which he had entered in Belgium (two) years before its suppression. He was among the first who worked with such strenuous effort for the recall of the Society to America. Two or three times he filled the post of Superior of the entire mission. The patience and high spirits with which he bore so cheerfully the cross and wholesome purgatory of his ill health give hope that even now he is enjoying eternal peace and happiness." Be it said in justice to Father Neale that in all his disputes with Archbishop Marechal in which it was his duty as Superior to defend the rights of the Society, he was most reverent and courteous. We find but one instance, and that in a private letter to a Jesuit, in which he questioned the good faith of the other side. Regrettably, one cannot say the same about the treatment that he and fellow Jesuits, including the General, received from their opponents. After he had been Superior for a year, Father Dzierozynski had to complain to the General of a "hostile attitude towards not only those who opposed (the surrender of Whitemarsh) but towards the whole Society and the Institute itself—to traduce them, to cry them down, to threaten to ruin all Jesuits, etc."

The reader may wish to know how the matter was finally concluded. During the next three years after the death of Father Neale the case was argued back and forth before Propaganda, between the Archbishop represented by Dr. Gradwell and the General of the Society assisted chiefly by Father Kohlmann. It

became notorious and produced opposite effects in Europe and America. In Europe odium was stirred up against the Jesuits by the misrepresentations of their opponents, with consequent disparagement of the American Jesuits especially, who were made to appear as acting contrary to their General. In the United States the Church authorities were severely criticized by Catholics and non-Catholics alike because of their unfair claims against the Jesuits and because of what was considered their un-American attitude. Marechal, because of this growing unpopularity and because he feared the interference of the government, which of course recognized no jurisdiction of the Pope over American properties, wrote October 17, 1826, to Cardinal Somaglia, Prefect of the Congregation of Propaganda, and relinquished his claim to the farm.

As he still insisted on a pension for his personal sustenance, the General offered to pay him eight hundred Roman crowns annually through his agent Dr. Gradwell, the annuity to cease with his death. Both the Pope and Propaganda considered the offer fair and acceptable. The Archbishop did accept and signed the agreement with the General's stipulation, *durante mea naturali vita;* but he contradicted this by inserting a gloss or proviso making the agreement depend on the approval of his successors!!! He also claimed he had a right to demand such annuity for the eight years for which he had already been Archbishop but was willing to remit that because it was a personal debt. But the pension could not have been personal as it was in the case of his predecessors, as he had no such personal claim as theirs. They were members of the Body of Clergy or ex-Jesuits, and under the legal Constitution of that Body were entitled to the annuity. He was not. Neither could he claim a pension from revenue of the non-diocesan property of the Corporation; such alienation for extraneous purposes would have been illegal and contrary to the articles of incorporation.

It should be clear enough from the foregoing narra-

tive why the American Jesuits could not satisfy the Archbishop and thus avoid the long controversy and attendant unpleasant publicity. They could not admit the accusation that they possessed the property of the Archbishop and had invaded his rights; they could not yield their main support, the revenue from the property at Whitemarsh without a financial collapse, whereas they were able to show that the Archbishop had other ample resources both for his personal and diocesan needs. This was demonstrated when the Archbishop's will was probated. Moreover, they could not divert the property or revenue of the Corporation without violating the laws of Maryland under which they held the properties for over thirty years. The Archbishop had produced an opinion of Roger Brooke Taney, afterwards Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, to the effect that the Corporation could legally transfer its property to him. This opinion must have been given on *ex parte* evidence rather than from a complete understanding of the case. For when Marechal wrote to Mr. Daniel Brent of the Department of the Secretary of State to inquire if the Jesuits had induced the Secretary to write to Rome and protest against any interference of the Archbishop with their property, Mr. Brent denied that any such letter had ever been written, and he told the Archbishop further that the government certainly would not permit such interference.

When Archbishop Whitfield who had long been an intimate friend of Marechal succeeded him in the See of Baltimore that provisional clause, inserted in the General's pledge of an annuity, making its acceptance dependent on the successors of Marechal, was invoked and the dispute was about to begin again. But the General would have no more to do with it. He said that it was a matter to be settled between the Archbishop and the American Superior. The term of Archbishop Whitfield was short, only six years. He was succeeded by the Most Reverend Samuel Eccleston, October 19, 1834, as the fifth Archbishop of that

primatial See. It was finally agreed between him and Father Thomas Mulledy, the Second Provincial, to settle all claims by the payment of a sum of $800 which was to be invested as a fund for the diocese. Because the interest on this amount at five percent would yield only one half of the pension claimed, Archbishop Eccleston was willing to complete the fund by adding another $800 from his own personal resources.

Father Hughes furnishes an interesting table of contributions in real estate and money made by the Jesuits to the Archdiocese up to the time when this final payment to Archbishop Eccleston was made. First the annuities paid to Archbishop Carroll and Neale from 1789 until 1817 amounted to $24,980. A Jesuit property adjacent to a Church (old St. Peter's) in Baltimore and valued at $40,000, was donated in Archbishop Neale's time. Pensions to the amount of $13,800 were paid to Archbishop Marechal, Whitfield and Eccleston, between 1817 and 1836.

(*To be Continued*)

THE REVISION OF THE *RATIO STUDIORUM SUPERIORUM*

(Promulgated July 31, 1941)

EDWARD C. PHILLIPS, S.J.

I. Historical Background

In 1832 Very Reverend Father General John Roothaan issued for the newly re-established Society a revised edition of the older *Ratio* of 1599, the better to accommodate its prescriptions, and more particularly its curriculum, to the needs of the times. The intention was to introduce the 1832 revision "ad experiment" for some years after which advantage would be taken of the experience of the various Provinces to modify and perfect the instrument, if necessary, and then to make it definitive and permanently obligatory. This intention was never carried out: twenty years later, in 1853, the matter was taken up in the 22nd General Congregation which elected the successor to Father Roothaan and instructed the new General, Father Peter Beck, to prepare an official edition of the *Ratio,* using for this purpose the critiques on the 1832 *Ratio* received from the Provinces. This edition would then be binding on all, with the understanding, however, that in matters not affecting the substantial points of the *Ratio,* each Provincial should have authority to make whatever adjustments he deemed called for by local conditions of time and place.[1]

No new "official edition" of the 1832 *Ratio* appeared, however, and the 25th General Congregation, which convened in 1906, renewed the discussion but decided that the wide diversity of school legislation and practice in different countries made it impracticable at that time for the Society to draw up a standard curric-

[1] Cf. Decree 38 of the XXII Gen. Congr.

ulum for its schools. Hence the Congregation, whilst urging all to adhere firmly to the teaching methods of the *Ratio* and its alignment of essential and subordinate branches of the curriculum, allowed the individual Provinces to draft their own courses of studies and submit them to the General for his approval.[2]

The gist of all this is that in the new Society there has never been a complete and detailed *Ratio* which could be considered either as universal or final, and therefore our studies both in the Scholasticates and in the Colleges have been governed, *in detail*, by "Ordinationes Generalium" rather than by legislation or Decrees of General Congregations. However, the *substantials* set down by St. Ignatius in the 4th part of the Constitutions and embodied in the Ratio of 1599 have always had and still retain the force and character of *law* for the whole Society.[3]

II. Recent Legislation of the Holy See

The continuous and rapid developments which have been taking place since 1906 in educational systems, methods and curricula, some of which directly affect the studies of our own Scholastics, made the need felt for further revision. The recent legislation of the Church embodied in the Apostolic Constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* and in the implementing *Ordinationes* of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities[4] made imperative a definite revision of at least the Ratio Studiorum Superiorum to embody in our own legislation for the conduct of our scholasticates the new prescriptions of the Holy See and to adapt existing Society regulations to those prescriptions.

The Apostolic Constitution was issued on Pentecost

---

[2] Cf. Decree 12.

[3] Cf. Statuta, n. 2. (For further details see *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*, by Father Allan Farrell, S.J., Milwaukee, 1938, pp. 394-396).

[4] Cf. Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Vol. XXIII (1931), pp. 241 ff.

Sunday, May 24, 1931, and the *Ordinationes* on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, June 12, 1931. All the prescriptions of both documents became mandatory (though not retroactive) beginning with the school year 1932-1933, in all Seminaries and Scholasticates empowered to grant pontifical degrees.[5] On August 19, 1931, Very Rev. Father General Vladimir Ledochowski wrote to His Holiness in the name of the Society to thank him for the new benefit conferred upon the Church and the Society by this educational legislation and to promise the Society's complete and faithful execution of all its prescriptions[6]; and on the same day the Holy Father, Pius XI, through the then Secretary of State, Cardinal Eugene Pacelli, answered to express the joy he felt in being reminded of the well-known obedience of the Society, knowing as he did the great fruits which would thereby accrue to the numerous students, both religious and secular, preparing for the priesthood in the institutions conducted by the Society. It may be worth while to quote explicitly the pertinent paragraph of the Pope's reply: which is here given in the Latin translation from the original Italian:

> "Sed quando Paternitas Vestra integram et fidelem illius Constitutionis prescriptorum observationem Christi Vicario promittit, vehementius Is laetatur, cum optime sciat quam ingenti juniorum levitarum phalangi Societas ista doctrinalem institutionem praestet, quae ad eos lucem mundi et sal terrae efficiendos tantopere conducit." [7]

On the Feast of St. Ignatius, that same year, Father General had already written to all the Provinces in which there were scholasticates, instructing the Provincials to send to Rome tentative texts for the *Statutum cum Ratione Studiorum* to be drawn up in accordance with the new Church legislation. This was required before the power to confer pontifical degrees would be granted to those scholasticates not yet pos-

---

[5] Const. *Deus Scien. Dom.*, art. 53.

[6] *Acta Romana*, Vol. VI, 1931, pp. 723-725.

[7] *ibid.*, pp. 726-727.

sessing it, or renewed for those institutions (like Woodstock College) which already possessed a pontifical charter.[8] These tentative or sample *Statuta* would be used by the Commission which was to be called to Rome to draw up a final form for submission to the Holy See for approval: in this way it was hoped that the *Statuta* would better provide for the diversified needs of the various countries in which our scholasticates are situated.

The Commission just mentioned, which convened in November, 1931, consisted of sixteen Fathers representing all the seven Assistancies. The roster of the Committee, published in the *Memorabilia S.J.*, Vol. IV, fasc. IV, p. 242, was as follows:

COMMISSIO AD STUDIA NOSTRA
SECUNDUM CONSTITUTIONEM APOST.
"DEUS SCIENTIARUM DOMINUS" ORDINANDA

Praeses Commissionis
Adm. Rev. Pater Noster Generalis.
Membra Commissionis

1. P. Bea Augustinus	Praeses Instituti Biblici .....Germ. Sup.
2. P. Coemans Augustus	Parat edit. Institut. recogn. .....Belg.
3. P. Dezza Paulus	Professor Metaphys. Gen. in Univ. Greg., Vice-Secretarius .....Venet.
4. P. Errandonea Ignatius	Adiut. Secret. Societatis, Secretarius .....Castell.
5. P. de Ghellinick Iosephus	Lect. Patrol. et Hist. Dogm. in Coll. Max. Lovan. .....Belg.
6. P. de Guibert Iosephus	Praef. Stud. Curs. Mag. et Prof. Theol. ascet. et Myst. in Univ. Greg...Tolos.
7. P. Hoenen Petrus	Profess. Cosmol. in Univ. Gregor. .....Neerl.
8. P. Keeler Leo	Profess. Philos. recent. et Hist. Philos. in Univ. Gregor. .....Missour.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 845-847.

9. P. Lohn Ladislaus	Profess. Theol. in Univ. Gregor .....Polon. Min.
10. P. McCormick Vincentius	Rect. Coll. Max. Prov. Marylandiae ..Maryl.-N.E.
11. P. Marxuach Franciscus	Profess. Theod. et Cosmol. in Coll. Max. Provinc. Aragoniae .....Arag.
12. P. Mostaza Michael	Profess. Iuris Can. in Univ. Gregor. .....Legion.
13. P. Nerney Dionysius	Profess. Theol. Dogm. in Univ. Greg. .....Hibern
14. P. Palermo Lazzarini Dom.	Praef. Stud. in P. Univ. Gregor. .....Rom.
15. P. Picard Carolus	Prof. Theol. Dogm. in Coll. Max. Prov. Camp. ....Camp.
16. P. Silva Tarouca Carolus	Profess. Theol. posit. et Hist. Eccles. in Univ. Gregor. .....Cechoslov.

After three months of continuous and strenuous labor during which they examined all the principal points pertaining to our studies, they gave their report to Fr. General in which various modes of procedure were suggested: among them was the recommendation that *one common form of statuta* should be prepared for *all our scholasticates* and submitted to the Holy See for a general approval. This was the procedure adopted by Father General. For its execution he appointed a reduced Commission of four Fathers to whom he turned over the suggestions and comments of the larger Commission.

Under date of May 1, 1932, Father General informed all the Provincials that these *Statuta* had been completed and would soon be submitted to the Holy See. In the meantime a compendium was prepared and this was being communicated to all the Provincials with instructions for its *ad interim* application as a guide in arranging the course of studies for the ensuing scholasticate year 1932-1933.[9]

[9] *A.R.*, Vol. VII, pp. 137-140.

III. Pontifical Approval of the Society's Statuta

When the *Statuta* was submitted the Holy See acted promptly and, under date of September 8, 1932, His Eminence, Cardinal Bisleti informed Very Rev. Father General that the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities had made a preliminary and summary examination of the proposed Statuta, had found them to be in substantial agreement with the new Papal legislation and that, consequently, they could be put into operation at once as the basis for the granting of Pontifical Degrees by the Society in the Schools listed in an accompanying schedule of 28 scholasticates scattered all over the world. Three of these scholasticates to which the power of conferring degrees was thus granted were in the American Assistancy: St. Louis University, with power to grant the Doctorate (*Laurea*) in both Philosophy and Theology; Weston College, empowered to grant the Licentiate in Philosophy and the Doctorate in Theology; and Mt. St. Michael's, Hillyard, Washington, with power to grant the Licentiate in Philosophy only. Woodstock College was not included in this list, because its Statuta had been separately presented to the Holy See and had been given Pontifical approval two days previously (Sept. 6, 1932), together with a confirmation of the Pontifical Charter which Woodstock had inherited from Georgetown University. The original grant was made to Georgetown in 1833 by Pope Gregory XVI. This charter enables Woodstock to grant the Doctorate in both Philosophy and Theology. The Statuta of the Gregorian University, its associated Pontifical Institutes and a number of other Pontifical Seminaries and Faculties conducted by the Society also received approval in the grant of Sept. 6.[10]

This preliminary approval of the Holy See was communicated by Father General to all the Provincials

[10] *A.R.*, Vol. VII, pp. 62-64.

that same month, under date of Sept. 27, along with copies of the temporarily approved Statuta for all the Scholasticates involved.[11] Since these Statuta had received only preliminary and tentative approval and hence might have to undergo some changes, they were communicated confidentially (*"tamquam reservata"*) for the use of Superiors and of the members of the Faculties. These Statuta, constituting in fact a new but partial Ratio Studiorum Superiorum, became obligatory and were to be followed in all substantial matters at once, beginning with the then current school year of 1932-1933.

Two and a half years after the temporary approval, the Holy See, on Feb. 2, 1934, definitively approved and made mandatory the common *Statuta Facultatum Philosophiae et Theologiae in Collegiis Societatis Jesu erectarum* by the following rescript:

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS

Sacra Congregatio de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus haec Statuta ad Constitutionem Apostolicam *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* eidemque annexas "Ordinationes" accommodata auctoritate a SS. mo D.N. Pio PP. XI sibi facta, approbet et ut fideliter observentur praescribit.

Romae, ex aedibus S. Callisti, die 2 februarii 1934, in festo Purificationis B.M.V.

Caietanus Card. BISLETI
Praefectus
Ernestus Ruffini, Secretarius.

The full text of the Statuta thus approved was published in the Acta Romana, Vol. VII, 1934, pp. 608-633. It should be remarked that these Statuta, as approved and imposed by the Holy See, apply directly only to the studies of *our own Scholastics* who are studying in our own Scholasticates or Universities *for pontifical degrees.*[12] For this reason their approval by the Holy See did not empower our Universities to confer pontifical degrees on Scholastics of other religious orders

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 168-170.

[12] Cf. *Statuta*, n. 1, par. 3.

or congregations or on students for the secular Priesthood, even though these followed exactly the same courses as our own Scholastics. This restriction, however, did not apply to the Gregorian University and its associated Pontifical Institutes for which separate Statuta, extending to all students of those Institutes, were approved by the Holy See on August 7, 1934.[13] Furthermore, this restriction was relaxed in 1937 for St. Louis University so as to allow it to grant pontifical degrees to the Resurrectionist students (members of the *Congregatio a Resurrectione D.N.J.C.*) who regularly make their studies under our direction.[14]

So much for the History of the *Statuta;*—we now take up the history of the *revision of the Ratio* Studiorum Superiorum.

IV. Preparations for the Revision

The Apostolic Constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* (Art. 5) requires that each University or *Facultas* seeking a grant or continuation of the power to confer degrees must submit for approval of the Holy See its *"Statuta cum Ratione Studiorum."*

This *Ratio Studiorum,* the Apostolic Constitution prescribes, must cover the following matters:

1. Methodus generalis docendi
2. Studiorum curriculum
3. Disciplina et examina

Titulus III of the Constitution, devoted to this subject, contains six articles (29-34), covering two and a half octavo pages. The *Ordinationes* of the Congregation (*Tit. III,* articles 18-34) goes into greater detail, especially concerning the subjects (*disciplinae*) to be taught and the examinations to be undergone by the students. It also gives in its Appendix I a long list, covering two pages, of appropriate *"Disciplinae speciales"* and *"Cursus peculiares."* In all, ten and a half

[13] As far as can be learned now, the particular Statuta of Woodstock College previously sent to Rome lapsed with the publication of the general Statuta and were superseded by them.

[14] Cf. *A.R.,* Vol. VIII, 1937, p. 710.

pages are devoted to describing the *Ratio Studiorum* which is prescribed.

The *Statuta* of the Jesuit Scholasticates, in its *Titulus III*, goes into some further detail especially as to the "General Method of Teaching" and the required examinations. This Title contains 11 pages.

It is clear from this enumeration that the "Ratio Studiorum" which is embodied in these recent official documents, constituting the fundamental legislation of the Church and of the Society, is much less extensive, both in the matters it treats of and in the detailed exposition of these matters, than the instrument which is universally known as the "Ratio Studiorum" of the Society. Furthermore it was clear that the older *Ratio* of 1599 and the *ad interim* revision which succeeded it required very considerable modification in order to bring them up to date and into full and faithful agreement with the present requirements of the Holy See.

It was therefore decided to make a thorough revision of the Ratio, starting with the *Ratio Studiorum Superiorum Nostrorum*, i.e. of that part of the general Ratio which pertains to the Faculties of Philosophy and Theology in our Scholasticates. It will be seen therefore that the scope of this first step in the revision is fairly restricted. It does not apply to our Schools for externs but only to the scholasticates. It does not, furthermore, extend to the "lower" studies, i.e. the Juniorate curriculum.

On the other hand it has a considerably wider scope than the *"Statuta cum Ratione Studiorum"*, because the "Statuta" apply only to those studies which are required by the Holy See (and therefore by the Society also) for our Scholastics studying for the pontifical degrees in Philosophy and Theology, whilst the new "Ratio Studiorum Superiorum" applies to *all* our Philosophers and Theologians whether they be in "Long Course" or "Short Course" and to *all Scholasticates* whether they have received power to confer pontifical degrees or not; it also deals with studies to be made either in ecclesiastical or civil universities

after securing the pontifical *Licentia* or *Laurea,* and with due preparation for the various other ministries of the Society even when such preparation does not come within the scope of the obligatory Scholasticate studies.

In 1933 a Committee appointed for that purpose prepared at the cost of five strenuous months of labor, including 46 committee sessions,[15] the first draft (*"primum schema"*) of the *"Ratio Studiorum Societatis Jesu pro Philosophia et Thelogolia."* The first paragraph of this document, which in its printed form extends to 106 octavo pages, reads as follows:

> In hac parte Rationis Studiorum agetur de his quae ad institutionem *Scholasticorum Nostrorum* in universa Philosophia et Theologia pertinent, et quidem tum de his quae ex Societatis praescriptis exiguntur, tum etiam de his quae secundum recentes Ecclesiae leges ad obtinendos gradus academicos necessaria sunt.

V. The "Primum Schema" of the Revised Ratio

This preliminary text, which we shall hereafter designate as Schema I, was sent under date of August 15, 1934 [16] as a confidenital document to all the Provinces and to those Vice-Provinces and Missions in which there were Scholasticates of Philosophy and/or Theology, with instructions that it should be studied by the Provincial and by three others appointed by him; these should be the Rector of the Scholasticate and two other Fathers with special qualifications for this task. Each one of these "readers" was to study the document and give first his general estimate of the "Ratio" as a whole, and then (on cards of uniform size supplied to them for ease in filing) his detailed comments, suggestions, queries, objections, etc., on the individual sections and paragraphs. These were sent to Rome along with all the copies of the Schema. Three months was set as the period within which the "readers" should complete their work of criticism.

---

[15] Cf. *A.R.*, Vol. VII, 1934, p. 784.

[16] *A.R.*, Vol. VII, 1934, p. 861-63.

Thus towards the end of 1934 Father General received the individuals' reactions to this text from probably more than a hundred critics dispersed throughout the world. The number of cards and hence approximately also of suggestions or comments exceeded 2300. Father Gabriel Huarte, Superior of the Roman House of Writers and also a "Revisor Gen. libr. et Rat. Stud.", and Father Dominic Palermo Lazzarini, formerly Prefect of Studies of the Gregorian University, and likewise a "Revisor gen. libr." and a Consultor of the S. Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, were entrusted with the task of studying and coordinating all these comments and then of amending the text of the Schema I according to the more important and consistent of the comments which had been submitted. To assist in the fulfillment of this task, a second copy of all the comments was made on cards and these were filed in order of subject-matter, whilst the first set was filed in numerical order according to the numbering of the paragraphs from 1 to 385 of the text of the Schema. The labors of this small Committee resulted in the amended MS text which was designated as the Schema II.

VI. The Revision Referred to the Proximate 28th General Congregation

It was the intention of Rev. Fr. General to promulgate the Schema I "ad experimentum" as was announced by him in his First Exhortation to the Fathers of the 1933 Triennial Congregation of Procurators on September 27 of that year.[17] This intention, however, was not carried out because, on reviewing the text, it was decided that a number of its regulations and prescriptions involved changes from former legislation which could not be made except by the supreme authority of a General Congregation. The resulting delay which terminated on the Feast of St. Ignatius,

[17] *A.R.*, Vol. VII, 1933, p. 509-510; see also the next to last paragraph of his letter to the Provincials on May 13, 1934 (A.R., Vol. VII, 1934, p. 784).

1941, was first explained by Fr. General in his letter of October 10, 1937.[18]

The decision to call a General Congregation for this and other important matters was officially announced in the letter of indication sent to the whole Society on October 10, 1937, in which the date March 12, 1938, was set for the opening of the Congregation.

In the interim various Committees were appointed, similar to our Congressional Committees, to prepare documented Reports called "Relations" on the various problems to be dealt with in the Congregation, and naturally one of these was entrusted with the subject-matter of the Society's higher studies. The praenotanda to the Report of this Committee sets forth its purpose very clearly and a free translation of it is here given:

> In order to assist the General Congregation as much as possible in treating certain difficult questions pertaining to the Philosophical and Theological studies of Ours, Very Rev. Fr. General appointed a Commission of six Fathers who should examine these questions and discuss them in common sessions. The members were Fr. Augustine Bea (Chairman); Fr. Joseph Filograssi, Fr. Peter Hoenen, Fr. Gabriel Huarte, Dominic Palermo Lazzarini, and Joachim Salaverri. This Commission having diligently studied the matter entrusted to it and having discussed it in many meetings, humbly presents to the General Congregation this Report on the status of the various problems involved and offers a series of resolutions (Postulata) setting forth what they believe to be the proper solution of these problems.

This Report—37 typewritten pages—was mimeographed and distributed on March 19 to all the Fathers of the Congregation to be considered at their leisure, though action was not to be taken on it until several weeks later. It contained rather extensive historical information as well as detailed practical discussions of the problems themselves, of the various solutions offered for them, of the objections, difficulties, advantages and disadvantages involved in the proposed solutions and finally seven "Postulata" embodying the conclusions reached by the Commission itself as to the

[18] *A.R.*, Vol. VIII, 1937, p. 801.

action which it thought should be taken in regard to our Scholasticate studies.

Each "Postulatum" was then analysed and further explained in the light of its historical background and of the discussions held by the Commission prior to its adoption.

The Postulata are in effect proposed forms of decrees to be enacted by the Congregation if they should meet with approval.

VII. Parliamentary Procedure of a General Congregation

It may be well to indicate briefly the method of procedure prescribed for the General Congregation in its discussions and its legislation. This method is contained in the "Formula Congregationis Generalis" which contains the parliamentary rules governing the Society's supreme legislative body.

The General Congregation must be preceded by Provincial Congregations (which have their own parliamentary rules given in the "Formula Congregationis Provincialis") in all the Provinces and in the independent Vice-Provinces and Missions throughout the world. Each of these Congregations draws up "Postulata" to be sent to Rome which are requests directed either to the Congregation itself or to Father General; if they are requests for new *legislation* or *Decrees* they must be sent to the Congregation, whereas requests for administrative action may be addressed to Father General. The individual members of the Society also have the right to send such Postulates to Rome, either directly to the Congregation and to Father General, or through the intermediary of members of the Congregation or certain officials of the Society.

All the Postulates thus sent to the Congregation from whatever source are first submitted to a Committee called the "Commissio ad secernenda Postulata" whose members are elected by the Congregation in one of its early sessions. Their duty is to decide what should be done with the Postulates; each Postulate is

examined and labeled "Admissum", "Remissum ad Patrem Generalem," or "Rejectum." Those designated "Admissum" come to the floor of the Congregation for its public consideration, discussion and action. Some are judged not to need any action at all by the Congregation itself and are entrusted to Father General for whatever action he may judge proper. Those marked "Rejectum" usually receive this designation because the Commission judges them to be unconstitutional, or harmful rather than helpful to the Society, or impracticable, or useless, or mere repetitions of earlier Postulata already routed to the floor of the Congregation.

It should be remembered, however, that copies of *all* the Postulata, even those referred to Father General or rejected by the Commission, are distributed to the Fathers of the Congregation. After all the "admitted postulata" have been acted on, then any member may bring up any of the rejected Postulata with the request that the Congregation take it up for discussion; this motion is put to the Congregation which decides by the majority vote whether to act on it or not, and hence the Commission has no absolute power to suppress or bar any Postulatum whatever from consideration by the whole Congregation.

In order that the consideration of the Postulata may be carried on more expeditiously and also with greater knowledge of all the elements involved, various Committees in addition to the one just mentioned are appointed to study the problems relating to a given field, to examine all the Postulata pertaining to such a field, to make recommendations as to what action seems called for and to prepare the appropriate text of the required decree or legislation. One of these Committees was the "Commissio IV-Pro Studiis Superioribus Nostrorum." The members of this Commission drawn from all the seven Assistancies (the eighth or Latin American Assistancy had not yet been established when the Committee was appointed) were the following: Fr. Joseph Filograssi, (Ital. Assist.); Fr.

Augustine Bea (Germ. Assist.); Fr. Leonitus Aurel (French Assist.); Fr. Joseph de Aldama and Fr. Gabriel Huarte (Spanish Assist.); Fr. Joseph Creusen and Fr. John Hannon (English Assist.); Fr. John Hynes and Fr. Edward Phillips (Amer. Assist.); and Fr. Ladislaus Lohn (Slavic Assist.).

This Committee received a large number of Postulates because out of the total of all the Postulata sent to Rome from various parts of the world a considerable proportion referred to the Scholasticate and post-Scholasticate (Doctoral) training of Ours. The procedure of this as well as of the other Committees was fixed by the Congregation (in its 4th Decree) and was as follows:

1. The Committee first prepares a Report (Relatio) of one of the Postulates entrusted to it, or on several Postulates relating to a single problem, and this Report is communicated in writing (mimeographed) to all the Fathers, and these are invited to study the Report and submit, also in writing, their comments and suggestions on the matter; the problem is then studied once more by the Committee in the light of all the comments received and the revised judgment of the Committee is re-submitted, always in writing, to the Fathers. All this takes place before the Postulatum is presented to the Congregation in public session.

2. When the time set for the public discussion of the problem has arrived, a member of the Committee makes a verbal report and outlines the highlights of the discussion of the problem by the Committee during the sessions on it; the matter is then thrown open to debate by the Congregation.

3. After the public debate, the question, usually in the form of a decree, is either put to a vote at once, or in the case of the more complex problems after an interval of one or several days. The vote is taken either by a show of hands, or by roll call, or (if the Congregation so rules, as it did only on very rare occasions) by secret ballot; a majority of affirmative votes is required for passage of the measure.

By way of digression, it may be well to add here, that as the Congregation is the supreme legislative body of the Society there is no ordinary veto power over its decrees; however, the deciding vote just

referred to does not make the decree absolute: in place of the "veto" power of some executive officer, e.g. Father General, there is a universal power of "intercessio"; that is, any member of the Congregtaion can within the three days following the first enactment or passage of the decree, interpose his objection or "intercessio" and call for a reconsideration of the decree: the Congregation must then take the matter up once more and decide by majority vote whether or not to sustain the decree as it stands or to reopen the discussion on it; in the latter supposition, after the renewed discussion the decree is once more put to the vote and is either passed as it stands, passed with modification or simply rejected; if it is rejected, nothing further happens unless a new postulatum treating of the same or a closely associated problem is presented to the Congregation.[19]

The Commissio IV (one of the busiest of all the 12 Commissions) started its labors very shortly after the opening of the Congregation: it was appointed on Sunday, March 13, and held its first session on Tuesday the 15th, and thereafter it met on an average of five times a week, holding in all 37 sessions, the average duration of a session being an hour and a half. As the members of this Commission had to attend all the general sessions of the Congregation, 59 in all, and had to take their part in studying and commenting on the reports of all the other Committees, it will be seen that they were kept more than usually occupied most of the time, and it may occur to some to think that from all their labors not much resulted, since the Congregation passed only five decrees on Higher Studies and only three of these, Decrees 36, 37 and 39 really "settled anything." However, the General Congregation studied this matter in 21 of its 59 sessions, and in its discussions laid the foundations for the guidance of those concerned in drawing up the Revised Ratio, the broad outlines of which the Congregation also laid

[19] Cf. Formula Cong. Gen., n. 128.

down partially in its two other decrees on higher studies, 38 and 40, and more fully in a set of "Normae" which it issued in the form of an "Instruction for the Commission" which was to assist Father General in drawing up the text.

VIII. Establishment and Approval of the "Committee on Revision"

By its 38th Decree the Congregation committed to Father General the task of making the needed revision and gave him the power to make any necessary changes in the older Ratio even though these might involve derogation of some of the decrees of the 27th Congregation; at the same time it recommended that Father General should establish a Commission or Committee to help him in this revision, and, at Fr. General's suggestion, reserved to itself approval of the membership of this Committee. The manner in which the members were selected is described in the 10th of the "Historical decrees" of the Congregation where we read that the members of each of the eight Assistencies met separately under the chairmanship of their Father Assistant and named several (at least two) Fathers belonging to the Assistancy but not necessarily members of the Congregation. From these nominees Father General chose the first on the list of each Assistancy except that, in the case of one (i.e. the English) Assistancy, the second one on the list was chosen because the duties of the first made his return to his Province imperative. The Committee thus formed by Fr. General was approved by the Congregation in its 57th Session. Its members were: Fr. Joseph Filograssi (Ital. Assist.); Fr. Augustine Bea (Germ. Assist.); Fr. Rene Arnou (French Assist.); Fr. Gabriel Huarte (Span. Assist.); Fr. Charles Van de Vorst (Eng. Assist.);Fr. Edward C. Phillips (Amer. Assist.); Fr. John Nepomocene Zore (Slavic Assist.); and Fr. John M. Restrepo-Restrepo (of the newly constituted Assist. of Latin America). Fr. Bea was appointed Chairman and Fr. Zore Secretary of the Committee.

The General Congregation closed on May 9 and the Committee was instructed to report at the Gregorian University for its first session, presided over by Father General, on May 20. In this first session, His Paternity explained briefly the procedure to be followed: the Committee was to prepare the text with all care and thorough study and the fullest discussion: this discussion should be with entire freedom and great frankness; as soon as the Committee had agreed upon and drawn up the text for each of the subdivisions of the Ratio it should be sent to His Paternity who would review it and return it to the Committee wih his comments and with suggestions for any change which might seem required. He himself would not attend the meetings except perhaps once in a long while (for the encouragement of the Committee)—in fact this first meeting was the only one presided over by Father General.

The Committee would be given all the help possible in the way of documents and publications which might be of service. A Brother was assigned to assist the Committee as typist, and this was a great help since copies of all the preliminary as well as the final text of various sections and sub-sections were always promptly made and placed in the hands of all the members.

All but two of the members of the Committee were lodged at the Gregorian University where all the meetings were held in a room permanently assigned for that purpose; Father Bea, the Praeses of the Biblical Institute, lived at the Institute which is just opposite the University on the Piazza della Pilotta, and Father Huarte, Superior of the House of Writers, naturally lodged with his Community in the Borgo Santo Spirito. The meetings were held in the late afternoon from 5 to 7 or 5:30 to 7:30, so as to conclude about a half hour before supper time. During the first part of the time, until July 14 when the Committee recessed over the hottest part of the Roman summer, three of the members had no other duties in Rome. These were the

members from the English, the American and the Slavic Assistancies. When the Committee reconvened Father Van de Vorst, who had been appointed Tertian Master at Tronchiennes, was replaced by Fr. Joseph Creusen, Professor of Canon Law both in Louvain and at the Gregorian. It was he whose duties at Louvain had previously prevented him, though first on the list of the English Assistancy, from being chosen by Father General as the appointee from that Assistancy. He served on the Committee from October 2, 1938, up to the end, namely June 14, 1939, when the 135th and last session was held.

IX. The Work of the Committee

Of course there was much work to do outside the plenary sessions of the Committee; a few meetings were held by a small sub-Committee, but almost all of the preliminary work was done by individual members of the Committee according to the following plan.

A limited section, or a particular problem which might affect several different sections of the Ratio, was assigned to each of the members; it was his duty to prepare the preliminary text of the portion assigned to him: however, the whole Committee in regular session would make a summary examination of the section and decide on the broad general outlines which would be a guide or a norm for the work of the individual member. Of course this was facilitated by the fact that the Committee had at its disposal the printed Schema I and the MS Schema II mentioned above; it also had the decrees of the General Congregation definitely prescribing certain important points in the Ratio as well as the "Normae" or "Instructio" drawn up in the General Congregation. Besides these helps and guides, it had the 2300 and more suggestions of experienced critics who had examined Schema I. In addition it also had a number of special reports on certain problems (such as the "Exercitationes") by Jesuits with outstanding reputation as successful

teachers or directors of the studies of Ours. It also had received from the Faculties of several of our Scholasticates in different parts of the world reports sent in answer to official requests of the Committee for information on the subject of "QQ. Scientificae cum Philos. connexae" and on the "Elenchus QQ. tractandarum in Philos. et Theol."

With all this as a background the individual prepared the tentative text. Copies of this were made by the Brother and distributed to the members for their study before it was brought up for further discussion in the Committee sessions.

As mentioned above there were 135 sessions, each of about 2 hours duration; the total time spent in session was 259 hours, showing that the average length of the sessions was 1 hr. 55 minutes. The first portion of the work, from May 20 to July 13, 1938, inclusive, lasted 55 days during which 29 sessions were held: the second stage lasted from October 2, 1938, to June 14, 1939, a period of 287 days during which there were 106 sessions. The Committee was therefore in active engagement on the "project" for 342 days and held plenary meetings on about three days a week during that time.

The amount of work required outside the sessions was considerably greater; in particular the Secretary of the Committee had a great deal of work to do, and naturally those who had no other assigned duties in Rome could spend more time on the out-of-session activities of the Committee than the others who had their regular administrative and teaching duties to perform during most of that period. It was the experience of the writer that more than two hours work had to be done outside of the sessions for every hour in session, bringing the total time up to something over 800 clock hours. It may be well to record that, despite their other duties, the members were most faithful in attendance; barring a brief spell of sickness of one of the members, the members did not total more than 1% or at most 2% absences from the

135 meetings. Another point worth mentioning was the great freedom in discussion and the absence of friction or heat even when opinions diverged very considerably on some few points. This was coupled with an unanimous agreement upon the final text in almost every instance; in the few cases in which such agreement could not be reached, even after prolonged discussion, the policy followed was to prepare two versions of the text, giving the majority and the minority judgment respectively on the point at issue, thus leaving to Father General the choice of the version to be adopted. This however does not mean that Father General was in any way bound to adopt either of such alternative versions; in fact, Father General was not bound by any decision of the Committee since it had power to act only in an advisory capacity.

A cursory comparison of the text prepared by the Committee with the official text promulgated on July 31, 1941, shows that with few exceptions the Committee text was adopted, with only minor changes or with merely stylistic amendments. In some parts of the document the promulgated text went into further detail than that of the Committee: this is reflected in the greater number of paragraphs or sections of the official text which contains about 20% more numbered sections (315) than the Committee text (260 sections). On the other hand there has been some condensation in other portions of the text with the final result that the official text runs to about 23,000 words as compared with the approximately 25,000 of the Committee text.

As to style it was natural that in such a document, of which different parts were written by different members of the Committee, there should be appreciable differences of style, grammatical construction and purity of diction. However, lack of homogeneity was restricted by the fact that even the style and diction were often subject to discussion—and several of the members were really good Latinists. Their decisions

were sometimes questioned by other members who were more willing to sacrifice style and diction to the demands for making the meaning clearer to modern readers; but Forcellini generally carried the day and determined the choice of words. It is customary, in the production of ecclesiastical documents, to have one man entrusted with the duty of revising and unifying the style, where needed, before the final text is adopted: this was not done by the Committee since it was taken for granted that it would be done after Father General had drawn up the official version.

The work of the Committee was concluded in the middle of June, 1939, and the text it had prepared was sent to Very Rev. Father General at a time when the world was nominally at peace; but war was actually raging in the Far East, and every country was under the tension of the gathering hurricane of destruction which burst in all its fury about two months later.

X. The Official Text

Despite these conditions, however, Father General promptly entrusted the duty of going over the text of the Committee to the Fathers Assistant so as to have the advantage of their reactions and suggestions before proceeding to his own final revision. Upon its promulgation the resulting official text would become the law or rule governing the higher studies of the Society throughout the world—at least until the next General Congregation should meet and approve or amend it. There certainly had been no precipitate action in preparing the text of this Code of Jesuit Higher Education for its own members. Two more years were to elapse between the submission of the text to His Paternity and the promulgation of the New Ratio on the Feast of St. Ignatius, July 31, 1941. Even then the disruption of the normal means of publication and communication caused by World War II, prevented the immediate printing and distribution of the work. It was not printed in Rome, as it would have been in

normal times. A copy was flown across the Atlantic with instructions to have the printing done in the United States, whence distribution was to be made to North and South America, Canada, England, Ireland, Australia, India, Japan, Java, and Madagascar. The copies destined for the last four countries, however, have been held up on account of the war.

The Woodstock College Press was called upon to carry out the production of the text; and those who have seen the results agree that "it is a fine job." Father Allan Duggin was responsible for the editing of the work; the proof-reading was done by Father Walter Burghardt and Father Neil Twombly; whilst the actual printing was done by Brother Joseph Kopp, who is in charge of the College Printing Office.

XI. A Critique of the New Ratio

Father Joseph Glose, who was Prefect of Studies in the Department of Philosophy for a number of years and was acting Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy during the period covered by the preparation of the Committee Text, was asked to give a brief account of the New Ratio at the Annual National Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association held in Chicago, Illinois, April 6 - 10, 1942. With the consent of the author, and the kind permission of the Editor of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly,* Father Glose's Critique is here reprinted as a fitting conclusion to this article.[20]

The New Ratio

The printing of the new *Ratio Studiorum Superiorum S. I.* (Romae, 1941) was recently completed, and copies were distributed according to directions issued from Rome. The volume begins with an introductory letter of Very Reverend Father General and contains five parts, an appendix, a general index, and an "Index rerum analyticus."

[20] J.E.Q., Vol. V, No. 1, June, 1942, pp. 107-109.

Father General's introductory letter gives the reason for the revision of the *Ratio* for higher studies and the guiding principles of the revision. The advances made in positive knowledge and scientific method prompted Pope Pius XI to issue the Apostolic Constitution, *Deus Scientiarum Dominus*, in which he prescribed certain norms for the conduct of major seminaries and Catholic universities. These norms were enlarged upon by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities established for the direction of these schools of higher studies. In order to conform with these requirements, the last General Congregation mandated the revision of the *Ratio* for the faculties of philosophy and theology in our seminaries. The new *Ratio* does not directly touch upon either the program of studies pursued in our colleges for externs or the juniorate curriculum. It is *sui juris*, providing only for the higher studies of Ours; and primarily for the acquirement of Pontifical degrees for those who are following the long course. Moreover, the last General Congregation set certain conditions for the revision. The aims and principles of the old *Ratio* were not to be eliminated. Since these aims and principles had served the Church well in the past, and since the Church itself was not formulating new aims and principles, but merely adjusted them to changed policies of education, all that was of permanent value was to find a place in the new *Ratio*, side by side with the new in thought and method. This union of the permanent with the changeable is to be classed an "experimentum," obligatory, however, in all its provisions, until the next General Congregation, when success and failures can be tabulated and the prescriptions of the new *Ratio* better evaluated.

Part I confines itself to a more general application of the norms exacted by the Church in its endeavor to improve the intellectual discipline of seminaries. Perhaps the most interesting of these norms are those which insist upon the return to the sources of learning and the employment of the tools that science has put

at our disposal. Among the courses offered, scholastic philosophy and sacred theology are to have the first place, and this arrangement must go unchallenged. As a preparation for the higher studies of the major seminaries, a solid knowledge in humanistic studies is exacted.

Part II treats of the governing body of the seminaries of Ours. It includes Very Reverend Father General as the great chancellor of all Our schools of higher studies, the local provincials, rectors, prefects of studies, deans, and consultors of faculties. Each has his prescribed powers and duties with an easy and well defined principle of subordination, so that all may unite in providing correct and sound teaching with the explicit purpose of discovering the full worth of each scholastic and assisting him to attain the best in the priestly life.

Part V defines the attitude towards study expected from the scholastic. It is a brief, clear warning to be thorough but sane in the matter of study, and to be particularly mindful of the saying of St. Augustine: "tanto fructuosius cogitabis, quanto magis pie cogitaveris." The appendix is a chapter for the registrar's office where marks and credits are computed. It has put order into a subject that was vexing at times to both professor and dean. It is worth careful study, for it demonstrates how fairly and accurately the talents of scholastics are to be rated.

Parts III and IV I shall mention at length because in these sections methods of teaching are described in detail. Though these methods are prescribed for the professors of Our seminaries, it would appear that they could be of value to college teachers of philosophy and of natural science. There are other points of interest in these sections, such as the insistence upon special training for certain duties of the ministry, more or less incumbent upon all, and special studies after the seminary courses for a larger number of the teachers in Our colleges for externs; but it seems to me that the question of method offers the most vital

problem for the colleges. This is evident from the published proceedings of the Jesuit Philosophical Association and the Association of Jesuit Scientists. Both groups have awakened to the need of improved teaching in their courses. The teachers of philosophy have been discussing such questions as the aim of philosophy in the college curriculum and the advantage of the problem method as compared with the thesis method; the science teachers have been anxious to determine the proper attitude of a science teacher to philosophy and religion in the college curriculum. All college teachers of science and philosophy would find it interesting and useful to read the chapters treating of these subjects in Parts III and IV. There they will find expressed the latest thought of the Society on methods of teaching philosophy and natural science. The teachers of religion in the colleges would find a like help in the chapters on methods of teaching sacred theology.

I will mention a few items. In teaching philosophy the thesis form is to be employed. However, there should be a brief introduction presenting the total problem involved. The total problem should then be parceled out in theses. Each thesis should be clear, to the point, with modern adversaries prominent, and the proof put in syllogistic form, in so far as it is possible. The difficulties should be in syllogistic form. This analytic method should be followed by a synthetic presentation of the elements discussed in the different theses, so that the student may perceive the unity of a problem or of a treatise. The points that require positive knowledge should be gathered from original sources, and facts and texts should be interpreted according to scientific method. In the prelection the teacher is warned not to waste time on the obvious. He is expected to explain only the difficult and essential concepts. In order to avoid inactivity on the part of the student, frequent oral repetitions are prescribed and papers should be prepared by the student in the best scientific manner.

In treating scientific questions the professor of science is urged to avoid a division between natural science and philosophy. His attitude should be friendly rather than antagonistic to philosophy. His explanation of scientific fact should be accurate but critical. On the other hand he should show its relationship to philosophy without using it to establish philosophical theory.

Another lesson to be learned by college teachers from the new *Ratio* is the importance of philosophy and religion in a general education. Though it may be objected that the new *Ratio* was written for the training of priests, the Catholic layman must also be a true apostle of the faith. The new *Ratio* has a continual refrain in favor of scholastic philosophy and sacred theology. Although new subjects are found in the curricula of philosophy and theology, there is to be no overemphasis on these subjects to the detriment of scholastic philosophy and sacred theology which are to be considered the principal instruments for the defense and propagation of the faith.

JESUIT CHAPLAIN STATISTICS

The Office of the American Assistant gives, under date of June 1, 1943, the most recent report on Jesuit chaplains who are at present serving with the armed forces of our country.

153 priests of the Assistancy are listed as engaged now in the military apostolate. In alphabetical order, the several Provinces are represented in the roster as follows:

California	14
Chicago	13
Maryland-New York	59
Missouri	13
New England	24
New Orleans	21
Oregon	9
Total	153

One chaplain, Father Curtis J. Sharp, of the Oregon Province, is named as having "died in service." The New Orleans Province, whose 21 chaplains constitute more than ten percent of the ordained personnel of the Province, leads the list in that respect. Of the 153 priests who are listed, approximately one-fourth are with the Navy.

OBITUARY

FATHER RAYMOND CORRIGAN

1889-1943

Father Corrigan must have been highly pleased with his funeral. The College Church was filled with students and some 500 received Holy Communion during the requiem mass. Six scholastics, who had helped him edit the Historical Bulletin, bore the remains to the novitiate cemetery to lay them under the sheltering shadow of the great cross at Florissant.

After a summer which was spent in travel through Nebraska and Iowa with a baseball team, topped off with a pleasure trip to California, a wiry nineteen year old youth entered the novitiate at Florissant one August evening thirty-five years ago. He seemed to adapt himself to the new life from the first, although he later confessed that he wavered in his vocation till he made the long retreat. Then he burned the bridges behind him and began the earnest life of the novice. Only one incident interrupted the routine of the novitiate—he lost weight so rapidly as to alarm superiors and was sent to the infirmary where, under the kindly care of Brother Saeger, he recovered the lost avoirdupois and added a few pounds. As far as the writer knows, this is the only time Ray Corrigan needed medical attention for the next three decades till the first symptoms of the fatal disease four years ago.

During the Juniorate, he showed an aptitude for languages, classical and modern, although he did not measure up in English. This was due, perhaps, to a lack of reading in his earlier years. At Creighton he easily mastered the class assignments with a quick mind and a retentive memory, and devoted more time to athletics than to books. However, at college he came

in contact with a Rigge, an O'Connor and a Weir, and these scholarly men quickened his interest in studies. Perhaps the young religious owed more to the late Father Garraghan than to any other teacher. The latter delivered a course of brilliant lectures on studying history that opened vistas hitherto undreamed of by the scholastic. During recreation he set about getting a conversational knowledge of German and French. Later on, during his residence in British Honduras, he mastered Spanish. These languages would stand him in good stead during the eight years he was to spend in Europe.

After the Juniorate he studied philosophy at St. Louis University where his talents singled him out for public defenses and invitations to write papers for the Science Academy. It was during the third year of philosophy that a "mild scene" occurred between professor and student that added piquancy to what might have been just another lecture. Mr. Corrigan challenged a statement and the elderly priest gave a further explanation. The scholastic attacked the explanation and then the sparks flew for full ten minutes till the young philosopher subsided, discomfitted but unconvinced. That gives an index of the independence of thought he carried into his dealings with others. It caused a spirit of aloofness and sometimes of brusqueness. Even in dealing with superiors he was outspoken without, however, causing misunderstandings, since he was obedient and superiors were aware of this. One higher superior, for instance, once referred to him as "that dear priest of ours," and another wrote: "I thought a great deal of Father Corrigan. As a scholastic and especially as a priest, he was an unusually courageous soul."

After philosophy he went to Belize and then to Marquette for his fifth year of regency. Then he was sent to Europe for theology and history. After his ordination in Spain, he studied his last year at Falkenburg. Then followed tertianship at Paray la Monial and three years at German universities. He earned his

doctorate at Munich by writing his dissertation in German.

Now after a score of years of preparation, Father Corrigan began his priestly life of teaching, lecturing and writing. He was to exemplify in the next fifteen years the "spirit of Divine restlessness," which Archbishop Glennon once spoke of to describe the activity of the Society. He was eager to promote love of Christ and His Church. "Christ is the center of all history" became his oft-repeated slogan. During the first three years he spent at Detroit, he showed such zeal at both the University of Detroit and Marygrove that he is still vividly remembered, as a visitor discovered who casually met a number of the former students half a dozen years after Father Corrigan had left Detroit. He began to appear on the lecture platform where his first hand knowledge of the European scene coupled with wide reading helped to offset a none-too-polished delivery. He was by no means even a mediocre lecturer, but he could deliver his facts in a telling way. He was just getting his foot firmly in the stirrup when he was transferred to St. Mary's to teach Ecclesiastical history. Perhaps the quiet of the country did not appeal to one anxious to keep in touch with an ever changing world and the following year he was transferred to St. Louis to spend his last ten years at the university.

Here he became more active as the years wore on, teaching in both the graduate and undergraduate departments, directing the reading of students for their theses, appearing on the lecture platform, serving as chaplain of the Knights of Columbus (he became a fourth degree knight last year), attending conventions in the different cities where he usually took a conspicuous part, writing book reviews and articles, and editing the Historical Review.

Few professors in the university were as well equipped for their work, and none more enthusiastic. He came to be fairly idolized by the graduate students who came to learn that in spite of his exacting demands

for scholarship and a cold impersonal bearing, he was at their beck and call, ever ready to lend helpful suggestions for his wide knowledge of books and sources. On hearing of his death, a Vincentian wrote from California: ". . . inspiration came from Father Corrigan. No one for a moment could question his deep scholarship." An eminent Catholic historian wrote: "He was one of the finest men I have ever met. His priestly life was noble; his scholarship exact."

When the first symptoms of the fatal disease appeared, he was coming into his full stride, just turned fifty, and he refused to slow his pace. For three painful years he tried to ignore the disease, publishing a book, and preparing three others. One of them he finished on his deathbed. Writing did not come easy to him and the suffering increased the hardship. But he refused to yield. Only a month before the end, he wrote: "I just turned in the last ten pages needed to fill out a volume. It has taken me months to do the ten pages."

Few, even of those closely associated with him, suspected the spiritual stature of Father Corrigan till his last illness. After a serious operation at Rochester, he returned alone to St. Louis, fully aware that death was stalking him, fully resolved to carry on. He took up his routine life, reviewing books, answering the many letters of well wishers, presiding at an oral examination for a doctorate, teaching in the enforced absence of a professor, arranging schedule for the second semester, consulting the different members of the department, attending evening recreation, making an arduous auto trip to visit a former fellow novice in a Veterans' Hospital. He insisted on securing an Eastern Clergy Certificate with the thought of attending future history conventions.

But he was growing weaker and thinner and after a few weeks, he must needs stay close to his infirmary room. His strength was running out and he had to give up the active life and sit and wait. But he refused to become an invalid. He would surrender everything save his daily mass. With dogged determination he

continued to offer the Holy Sacrifice. From the day of his ordination till the time of hospitalization he had not missed mass save once when a delayed train caused him to break his twenty year record. It was his proud boast that he went to the altar each morning freshly shaved.

To one who suggested that he could get better treatment if he went to the hospital, he replied: "My mass is my life. Why prolong life a few days or weeks if I am not to say mass?"

The last week he became feeble and had to be wheeled to the chapel and assisted at the altar. Two days before the end he became limp at the end of mass and had to be carried to his room. He knew that he had said his last mass. Now he was willing to say his Nunc Dimittis. He asked to be taken to Desloge Hospital where he had served as chaplain. He must have experienced much pain during the single night he spent in the hospital, but with characteristic cheerfulness he told an inquirer he had had a good night. In the afternoon he passed to his reward without a struggle; unconscious several hours before the end. It was St. Agnes eve.

One who had been a fellow novice and had taken an interest in his manly display of courage and resignation wrote from Mundelein: "Most touching and edifying. There are men in the menology for less." Fr. Wm. J. McGucken, S.J., in the *Historical Bulletin* of St. Louis University, writes the following tribute to Fr. Corrigan:

An historian should write this tribute to Father Raymond Corrigan. Only an historian can set a right appreciation on his work, his unerring historical sense, his objectivity, his large tolerance. All, however, can appreciate his tremendous energy, the drive that urged him on ever to more work. He had taken to heart Saint Theresa's motto, *Labora, semper labora,* and her other, *Aut pati, aut mori,* and translated them into glowing golden realities that ruled his own life. Mysticism, incidentally, especially Spanish mysticism,

with which he had become acquainted during his years in Spain, intrigued him greatly. More, he lived it; this and his unassuming hidden asceticism guided his life's plan. He was a "man of the Exercises," simple and solid in his spirituality.

His published works consist of his dissertation *Die Kongregationen de Propaganda und Ihre Tätigkeit in Nord-Amerika,* and *The Church and the Nineteenth Century.* Besides this, there was constant and continuous labor as editor of the *Historical Bulletin,* as well as his contributions to other journals, *Mid-America, The Catholic Historical Review, America,* and other magazines. He had planned several volumes; one on liberalism, one on secularism, one a collection of portraits of Great Catholic Laymen down to the Nineteenth Century. The last manuscript is the only one that will be published. The miracle was that he accomplished so much with so little time. He always carried a heavy teaching schedule besides his work as chairman of the department of history and director of theses.

Many things went into the fashioning of the man, the scholar, the Jesuit. His Catholic upbringing, his contact with the Jesuits at Creighton, his Alma Mater, turned out a youth of singular uprightness who took almost naturally to religious life in the Society. His early scholastic years were unmarked by anything special except his steadfastness of purpose, his fidelity to every rule of religious life. After he finished his philosophical studies he was selected by his superiors for the mission in British Honduras. This came as a surprise, a welcome one. He had volunteered for the mission earlier but had been led to believe that he was to go on for higher studies. Undoubtedly his superiors believed that he was the type that would make a good missionary. Their hopes were more than realized. One cannot understand Father Corrigan if one does not take into consideration what the four years at Belize did for his soul. He never lost his missionary zeal. In his later years there was not much time for works of

the ministry. Yet he would steal time from his well-earned vacation to direct a retreat, to give tridua and to do other apostolic work. His students and others always found him a humane spiritual director, sympathetic yet forthright in giving solid spiritual advice.

After Belize, he spent his last year of regency teaching a semester at Saint Louis University and a semester at Marquette University. It was only then, apparently that he was told to prepare for historical work. He was sent for his theological studies to Barcelona, his fourth year was made at Valkenburgh in Holland, and his tertian year at Paray-le-Monial. At Barcelona he saw the forces at work that were to result in the Civil War and at Paray-le-Monial he saw the disrupting elements that were to lead to the defeat of France.

In Valkenburgh and later at Munich he saw the death of the Weimar Republic and the beginnings of the career of the comic paper-hanger. Life is not easy for an American in any of these places; yet he took it casually. After his tertianship he went to Munich to study for his doctorate. He took for the subject of his dissertation the work the Congregation of Propaganda had done in America—again the missionary motif in his life. This necessitated a stay in Rome for the investigation of the archives of the Congregation.

His contacts with European scholars left an indelible mark upon him; yet *pedantisme* was always far from him. He loathed red tape; he wanted results; if his students knew their "stuff" he did not care whether they had credits in it or not. Offhand and informal and genuinely tolerant he built up the department of history at Saint Louis University into a very cooperative organization; there was a notable lack of friction; the opinion of everyone in the department was respected; and the output of scholarly work was above the ordinary.

All could profit by the lessons of Father Corrigan's life—his selflessness, his devotion to truth, his painstaking, meticulous care, his scholarship, his devotion

to his students—was there ever any one who had more of the *facilis aditus* than Father Corrigan?—his contempt for fuss and pomposity, his hard-headed realism. His life taught his friends much; how much more his death.

> Nothing in his life
> Became him like the leaving it; he died
> As one that hath been studied in his death,
> To throw away the dearest thing he ow'd
> As 't were a careless trifle.

When he discovered last September at the Mayo Clinic that he had not long to live he accepted it stoically and as a matter of fact. It was as if he were turning over the next page of a book to glance at the last chapter. He returned to the University to do what he could. Death came on ruthlessly, yet with merciful swiftness. January 19 he died. The last week of his life those of us who were with him could see death stalking him day by day.

His ruling passion came to the fore then—his absolute devotion to the Mass, his stern asceticism. How St. Ignatius would have loved this man. He insisted up to the end on rising at five—before five actually—although again human wisdom was plucking at his elbow telling him that it was folly so to act. But this was the folly of the Cross and he would not be denied. "I fill up those things which are lacking in the sufferings of Christ." He offered up the ineffable sacrifice up to two days before he died. He should not have done so; human prudence should have dissuaded him. As we helped him into the wheel chair and took him down three flights of stairs to the chapel in the Lindell Building we felt each day would be his last; it was the reenactment of the Via Dolorosa that led to ancient Golgotha. The glory and the splendour of that Mass offered up for the sins of the world by this dying priest day after day was an unforgettable picture. Priests of less heroic mould would have foregone that privilege —surely none could blame them. But not Father Corrigan. He was an ordained priest; his mission was

to offer up the sacrifice; and "how I am straitened until it be accomplished."

Death for him was not an unwelcome visitor but a dear friend who opened for him the door that led to the City of Splendour where Christ the Son of God would welcome him home. It requires no imagination to imagine him saluting his Captain and Leader in his offhand fashion, "Well, Chief, I've done the job given to me—pretty well, pretty well."

The memory of this gallant soldier of Christ, worthy member of the Society of Jesus, whose asceticism was so very real yet always hidden, is the heritage that he has left to his religious brethren and his colleagues at Saint Louis University. May he rest in peace.

BROTHER THOMAS J. O'HARA

1866-1942

At 4:10 P. M. on Monday, September 28, 1942, Brother Thomas J. O'Hara died at the Novitiate of St. Isaac Jogues, Wernersville, Pennsylvania. He was close to seventy-six years old. Death came suddenly, but not unexpectedly, from a serious heart condition which had caused superiors to remove him, in 1940, from his work at St. Ignatius Rectory in New York City and to send him to Wernersville. The two years at the Novitiate, before God called him to his reward, were spiritually fruitful to one who had celebrated his golden jubilee before retiring from active service.

During those last two years of life, Brother O'Hara was a source of edification to the younger Brothers. He never lost his cheerfulness or gave himself to moodiness or gloomy thoughts. He was one of the first to appear every day at the morning visit to the Blessed Sacrament, and he was always eager to be

with the Brothers during their spiritual duties and to attend recreation with them. More than one of those in the formative period of the Society at Wernersville exclaimed after Brother O'Hara's death, "It was a help to us to see an old man so careful of his spiritual duties and so cheerful and happy-hearted despite his suffering."

Brother O'Hara was a native of Scranton, Pennsylvania. He was born December 2, 1866, and was the son of Thomas O'Hara and Anne Best O'Hara. He had three brothers and two sisters. He inherited the deep Catholic faith of his father and mother who had come from Ireland and, like most of the Irish youth in the coal-mine districts of Pennsylvania, he took up heavy labor as a livelihood. He became a boiler-maker. While employed at that trade in Cleveland, Ohio, his thoughts turned to the religious life and he applied for admission to the Society of Jesus.

He entered the Society on September 12, 1890, at the Novitiate in Frederick, Maryland. After taking his vows he remained in Frederick nine months before being sent to the colleges. Then came his first assignment. He went to the college of St. Francis Xavier in New York and, later on, to Fordham, St. Peter's in Jersey City, Gonzaga in Washington, D. C., Holy Cross, Boston College, and finally to St. Ignatius Rectory in New York, where he was stationed from 1911 to 1940. The range of work given him in the colleges required versatility, for we find him listed as assistant baker, sacristan, porter, wardrobe-keeper, refectorian, infirmarian, and assistant librarian. He would humorously remark that the only office not entrusted to him was the one of being the house tailer. "Superiors probably feared I would use boiler-rivets instead of needle and thread."

While at Fordham, during the school year of 1902-1903, Brother O'Hara had a serious and nearly fatal accident in the former faculty building, now called Dealy Hall. One night, at the end of a weary day of labor, he was waiting to make a report to the Father

Minister, whose room was on the high fourth floor, near the stairwell. The tired Brother leaned back against the low rail and dozed for a moment. In that moment of sleep, his tall broad-shouldered body lost balance and he went hurtling downward to crash at the foot of the stairwell, nearly fifty feet below. He was more dead than alive when carried, unconscious, to the college infirmary. Though he eventually recovered, the accident left its effects, for sometime, in a slowing down of his activities.

His fifty-two years in the Society and the varied nature of his work made him helpful in his advice to younger Brothers. He would warn them that in the smaller houses a Brother has a lonely life and may become "a forgotten man" and a discontented one unless he is faithful to prayer and is guided by the solid spiritual principles of the Society. While he enjoyed reading, the younger Brothers noticed that he was careful in the choice of books, selecting the lives of saints and near-saints and other works that would inspire him spiritually. It was of such books he loved to talk, and he did so intelligently and with enthusiasm.

On the day of his death he received Holy Communion at the Mass in the infirmary. In the afternoon he was more than usually active until he collapsed in his room. He was unconscious when given the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Requested to name the oustanding qualities of Brother O'Hara, one who knew him well replied, "Cheerfulness, friendliness, and seriousness in his religious life." May he rest in peace.

STATISTICS

RETREATS, 1942

BY THE FATHERS

of the

MARYLAND-NEW YORK PROVINCE

Diocesan Clergy

	Retreats	Retreatants
Newark, N. J.	2	440
Paterson, N. J.	2	104
Auriesville, N. Y.	11	106
Buffalo, N. Y.	2	403
New York, N. Y.	3	684
Ogdensburg, N. Y.	2	151
Hartford, Conn.	3	570
Wilmington, Del.	1	55
Boston, Mass.	2	376
Trenton, N. J.	2	185
Altoona, Pa.	2	140
Pittsburgh, Pa.	4	533
Richmond, Va.	2	96
Hamilton, Ontario	1	91
St. John's Newfoundland	1	45
	40	3,979

Seminarians

Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, N. J.	2	279
St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.	1	320
	3	599

Orders of Men

Jesuits:		
St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.	2	30
Teritanship, Auriesville, N. Y.	3	129
Brooklyn Prep School, Brooklyn, N. Y.	2	24
Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y.	2	8
Canisius High School, Buffalo, N. Y.	2	26

	Retreats	Retreatants
Inisfada, Manhasset, N. Y.	2	8
Fordham University, New York, N. Y.	3	90
Regis High School, New York, N. Y.	2	24
Xavier High School, New York, N. Y.	2	22
Novitiate, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	6	384
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.	2	12
Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.	2	28
Loyola College, Baltimore, Md.	2	12
Georgetown Preparatory School, Garrett Park, Md.	3	58
Loyola High School, Towson, Md.	2	20
Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.	4	505
Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.	1	62
St. Joseph's High School, Philadelphia, Pa.	2	26
University of Scranton, Scranton, Pa.	1	6
Novitiate, Wernersville, Pa.	4	385
Friars of the Atonement:		
Graymoor, Garrison, N. Y.	1	52
Discalced Carmelites:		
College of Our Lady, Washington, D. C.	1	26
Franciscans (Minor Conventuals):		
St. Anthony on Hudson, Rensselaer, N. Y.	2	54
Pallottine Fathers:		
Our Lady of Mount Carmel, New York, N. Y.	1	12
Brothers of Christian Schools:		
Normal Institute, Ammendale, Md.	1	32
Christian Brothers of Ireland:		
Power Memorial Academy, New York, N. Y.	1	28
Marist Brothers:		
St. Ann's Hermitage, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	4	237
Brothers of Mercy:		
Infirmary, Buffalo, N. Y.	1	9
Brothers of the Sacred Heart:		
St. Joseph's, Metuchen, N. J.	1	90
Coindre Hall, Huntington, N. Y.	1	45
Brothers of St. Francis Xavier:		
Sacred Heart Novitiate, Fortress Monroe, Va.	1	55
	64	2,499

Orders of Women

Sisters Auxiliaries of the Apostolate:		
St. Stanislaus Convent, Monongah, W. Va.	1	10

	Retreats	Retreatants
Little Sisters of the Assumption:		
Convent, Walden, N. Y.	2	30
Benedictines:		
Motherhouse, Erie, Pa.	1	35
Blessed Sacrament:		
St. Elizabeth's Convent, Cornwells Heights, Pa.	2	242
Bon Secours:		
Convent, Laurelton, N. J.	1	7
Carmelites:		
Monastery, Morristown, N. J.	1	15
Monastery, Schenectady, N. Y.	1	13
Monastery, Baltimore, Md.	1	20
Cenacle:		
Convent, Lake Ronkonkoma, N. Y.	1	60
Convent, New York, N. Y.	1	60
Convent, Newport, R. I.	1	30
Charity of Nazareth:		
St. Mary's Academy, Leonardtown, Md.	1	54
Charity of St. Vincent de Paul:		
St. Agatha Home, Nanuet, N. Y.	1	36
Mt. St. Vincent, New York, N. Y.	6	1,172
Seton Hill, Greensburg, Pa.	1	250
Christian Charity:		
Mallinckrodt Convent, Mendham, N. J.	3	257
St. Ann's Academy, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	1	67
Christian Doctrine:		
Marydell Convent, Nyack, N. Y.	1	36
Christian Education:		
St. Genevieve of the Pines, Asheville, N. C.	1	40
Divine Charity:		
St. Joseph's Hill, Staten Island, N. Y.	1	70
Divine Compassion:		
Good Counsel College, White Plains, N. Y.	2	171
St. Dorothy:		
St. Patrick's Academy, Staten Island, N. Y.	1	30
Convent, Providence, R. I.	1	18
Franciscans:		
St. Ann's Convent, Buffalo, N. Y.	1	30
Stella Niagara School, Buffalo, N. Y.	1	40
Sacred Heart Academy, Eggertsville, N. Y.	1	47
St. Francis Hospital, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	1	19
St. Anthony Convent, Syracuse, N. Y.	3	278

	Retreats	Retreatants
Our Lady of Angels, Glen Riddle, Pa.	1	271
Good Shepherd:		
Rest Hill, Wickatunk, N. J.	1	10
Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	27
Convent, Buffalo, N. Y.	2	103
Mt. St. Florence, Peekskill, N. Y.	5	105
Convent, Troy, N. Y.	2	36
Convent, Washington, D. C.	1	18
Convent, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	18
St. Joseph's Protectory, Norristown, Pa.	1	21
Heart of Mary:		
St. Joseph's Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	40
Nardin Academy, Buffalo, N. Y.	1	20
St. Joseph's Institute, Bronx, N. Y.	2	131
Holy Child Jesus:		
Old Knoll School, Summit, N. J	1	16
St. Walburga's Academy, New York, N. Y.	2	100
Convent, Suffern, N. Y.	2	46
Convent, Waukegan, Ill.	1	43
St. Edward's Convent, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	29
St. Leonard's Academy, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	41
Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa.	2	167
Convent, Sharon Hill, Pa.	3	219
Servants of the Holy Ghost:		
Sacred Heart Home, Hyattsville, Md.	1	9
Holy Names:		
Convent, Albany, N. Y.	1	78
Helpers of Holy Souls:		
St. Elmo's Hill, Chappaqua, N. Y.	2	35
Convent, New York, N. Y.	4	142
Immaculate Heart of Mary:		
Villa Marie, Stone Harbor, N. J.	1	192
Infant Jesus:		
Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	60
Jesus and Mary:		
Convent, Highland Mills, N. Y.	1	40
St. John the Baptist:		
Mt. St. John, White Plains, N. Y.	1	18
St. Joseph:		
St. Michael's Villa, Englewood, N. J.	3	233
Convent, Brentwood, N. Y.	1	344
Mt. St. Joseph, Buffalo, N. Y.	4	448
Nazareth Motherhouse, Rochester, N. Y.	1	60
St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N. Y.	2	402

	Retreats	Retreatants
Immaculate Heart Academy, Watertown, N. Y.	1	85
St. Joseph's Academy, McSherrystown, Pa.	2	250
Mt. St. Joseph, Chestnut Hill, Pa.	5	881
St. Joseph's Convent, Wheeling, W. Va.	1	86
Servants of Mary:		
Sacred Heart Convent, Massena, N. Y.	1	13
St. Mary of Namur:		
Mt. St. Mary, Kenmore, N. Y.	1	75
St. Joseph's Academy, Lockport, N. Y.	1	69
Mary Reparatrix:		
Convent, New York, N. Y.	2	83
Mercy:		
Convent, Albany, N. Y.	2	162
St. Agatha Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	14
St. Brigid Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	20
Holy Innocents Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	13
Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	55
Sacred Heart Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	14
St. Thomas Convent, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	16
Mt. Mercy Academy, Buffalo, N. Y.	2	197
Sanatorium Gabriels, Gabriels, N. Y.	1	52
St. Catharine's, Madison Avenue, N. Y. C.	3	222
St. Catharine's, West 152nd Street, N. Y. C.	2	47
St. John's Convent, Plattsburgh, N. Y.	1	30
Convent, Rensselaer, N. Y.	2	111
Convent, Rochester, N. Y.	1	106
St. Mary's Hospital, Saranac Lake, N. Y.	1	22
Our Lady of Mercy Academy, Syosset, N. Y.	3	314
Convent, Tarrytown, N. Y.	2	76
Mercy General Hospital, Tupper Lake, N. Y.	1	9
Convent, Washington, D. C.	1	17
Mt. St. Agnes, Baltimore, Md.	2	127
Mercy Hospital, Baltimore, Md.	1	44
Georgian Court College, Lakewood, N. J.	1	90
Mt. St. Mary, North Plainfield, N. J.	1	85
Mt. Aloysius, Cresson, Pa.	2	180
College Misericordiae, Dallas, Pa.	2	165
Mercyhurst College, Erie, Pa.	1	67
St. Genevieve Convent, Harrisburg, Pa.	2	80
Sylvan Heights Home, Harrisburg, Pa.	1	13
Mater Misercordiae, Merion, Pa.	3	355
St. Mary's Convent, Pittsburgh, Pa.	1	205
St. Mary's Convent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	1	76
Convent, St. John's, Newfoundland	1	105

	Retreats	Retreatants
Notre Dame de Namur:		
Trinity College, Washington, D. C.	1	126
Trinity Prep School, Ilchester, Md.	2	119
Convent, Moylan, Pa.	1	65
Convent, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	51
School Sisters of Notre Dame:		
College of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md.	2	620
Little Sisters of the Poor:		
Convent, Washington, D. C.	1	16
Convent, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	18
Convent, Germantown, Pa.	1	19
Poor Clares:		
Monastery, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	26
Presentation:		
Mt. St. Joseph, Newburgh, N. Y.	2	199
St. Michael's Convent, Staten Island, N. Y.	2	140
Convent, St. John's, Newfoundland	2	217
Providence:		
Immaculata Seminary, Washington, D. C.	1	75
Lady Isle, Portsmouth, N. H.	1	41
Oblate Sisters of Providence:		
St. Frances Convent, Baltimore, Md.	1	38
Handmaids of the Sacred Heart:		
Convent, Philadelphia, Pa.	1	19
Sacred Heart:		
Convent, Albany, N. Y.	3	235
Convent, Manhattanville, N. Y. C.	1	50
Convent, New York, N. Y.	1	27
Convent, Bronx, N. Y.	3	83
Convent, Rochester, N. Y.	3	96
Convent, Noroton, Conn.	4	144
Convent, Cincinnati, Ohio	1	55
Convent, Overbrook, Pa.	2	78
Convent, Torresdale, Pa.	2	101
Sacred Heart of Mary:		
Convent, Sag Harbor, N. Y.	1	40
Marymount College, Tarrytown, N. Y.	2	250
Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart:		
D'Youville College, Buffalo, N. Y.	1	77
Mission Helpers, Servants of the Sacred Heart:		
Sacred Heart Convent, Towson, Md.	2	77
Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart:		
Sacred Heart Villa, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.	1	109
Convent, West Park, N. Y.	1	20

	Retreats	Retreatants
Ursulines of the Blessed Virgin:		
Marygrove, Kingston, N. Y.	1	20
Mt. Ave Maria, Phoenicia, N. Y.	1	29
Ursulines:		
Hiddenbrooke, Beacon, N. Y.	2	50
Convent, Malone, N. Y.	2	54
Convent, Middletown, N. Y.	2	37
College of New Rochelle, N. Y.	2	175
Mt. St. Ursula, Bronx, N. Y.	2	149
Convent, Bronx, N. Y.	2	57
St. Jerome's Convent, Bronx, N. Y.	1	17
Convent, Wilmington, Del.	1	30
Convent, Washington, D. C.	1	15
Convent, Festus, Mo.	2	58
Vincentian Sisters of Charity:		
St. Vincent Hill, Perrysville, Pa.	1	153
Visitation:		
Monastery, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1	48
Monastery, Washington, D. C.	2	87
Monastery, Baltimore, Md.	2	50
Monastery, Frederick, Md.	2	59
Monastery, Wheeling, W. Va.	1	39
	235	15,648

Laymen

New Jersey:		
St. Peter's College, Jersey City	2	384
St. Peter's Prep School, Jersey City	1	816
Loyola House of Retreats, Morristown	54	2,248
Seton Hall College, South Orange	1	500
Seton Hall High School, South Orange	1	580
St. Michael's, Jersey City	1	42
New York:		
Christian Brothers Academy, Albany	1	555
Brooklyn Prep School, Brooklyn	1	539
Canisius College, Buffalo	3	838
Canisius High School, Buffalo	2	631
Ursuline Academy, Malone	1	67
Iona School, New Rochelle	1	250
St. Ann's Academy, New York	1	443
La Salle Academy, New York	1	685
Loyola School, New York	1	30
Regis High School, New York	3	666
Xavier High School, New York	2	800

	Retreats	Retreatants
Fordham University, Bronx	5	2,283
Mt. St. Michael's Academy, Bronx	4	891
Cardinal Farley Military Academy, Rhinecliff	1	24
Mount Manresa, Staten Island	45	1,934
Boys Camp, Conesus Lake	1	59
Connecticut:		
Sacred Heart Convent, Noroton	1	30
District of Columbia:		
Georgetown University, Washington	2	950
Gonzaga High School, Washington	2	560
Holy Name Church, Washington	1	150
St. Martin's Church, Washington	1	55
Maryland:		
Loyola College, Baltimore	1	412
Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg	1	178
Georgetown Prep School, Garrett Park	2	150
Loyola High School, Towson	2	495
Manresa on Severn, Annapolis	45	2,333
Mt. Calvary, Forestville	1	65
Holy Face, Great Mills	1	45
St. Mary's, Hagerstown	1	60
St. Nicholas, Pearson	1	40
Massachusetts:		
Holy Cross College, Worcester	1	800
Pennsylvania:		
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia	2	210
St. Joseph's High School, Philadelphia	3	988
Sacred Heart Convent, Torresdale	1	65
University of Scranton, Scranton	1	450
St. Peter's Cathedral, Erie	1	300
Catholic Worker Home, Philadelphia	1	36
	205	23,637

Laywomen

New Jersey:		
Dominican Academy, Caldwell	1	59
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station	2	537
St. Mary's High School, Elizabeth	1	350
St. Cecilia's High School, Englewood	1	460
St. Aloysius Academy, Jersey City	1	189
St. Joseph's Home for Blind, Jersey City	1	140
St. Michael's High School, Jersey City	1	430
Villa Pauline, Mendham	9	182

	Retreats	Retreatants
Immaculate Conception High School, Montclair	2	832
Our Lady of the Valley High School, Orange	1	438
St. Joseph's High School, Paterson	1	220
St. John the Baptist High School, Paterson	1	300
Villa Marie Claire, Hohokus	1	20
Blessed Trinity Missionary Cenacle, Stirling	2	49
Holy Name Hospital, Teaneck	1	90
Lacordaire Academy, Upper Montclair	1	38
Georgian Court College, Lakewood	3	251
St. Peter's High School, New Brunswick	1	640
Mt. St. Mary's Academy, North Plainfield	1	80
New York:		
Sacred Heart Academy, Albany	3	330
St. Mary's Hospital, Amsterdam	1	65
Holy Family High School, Auburn	1	170
St. Catharine's Hospital, Brooklyn	1	131
Ladycliff on Hudson, Highland Falls	1	102
Cenacle, Lake Ronkonkoma	5	208
St. Joseph's Academy, Lockport	1	70
Ursuline Academy, Malone	1	125
Ursuline Academy, Middletown	1	35
St. Agatha Home, Nanuet	1	280
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle	1	50
Ursuline School for Girls, New Rochelle	1	125
Blessed Sacrament Convent School, New York	1	50
St. Catharine's Academy, W. 152nd St., N. Y. C.	1	185
Cenacle, New York	9	476
Holy Cross Academy, New York	1	192
St. Lawrence's Academy, New York	1	62
Convent of Mary Reparatrix, New York	5	150
Our Lady of Lourdes Academy, New York	1	85
Manhattanville College, New York	2	490
Sacred Heart Academy, New York	3	285
St. Vincent's Hospital, New York	1	228
St. Walburga's Academy, New York	1	107
Little Sisters of the Poor, Bronx	1	200
Mt. St. Urusla Academy, Bronx	1	425
College of Mt. St. Vincent, Bronx	2	228
Sacred Heart Academy, Bronx	5	390
Ursuline Academy, Bronx	1	250
Marydell Convent, Nyack	1	26
A. Barton Hepburn Hospital, Ogdensburg	1	75
St. Joseph's Home, Peekskill	1	280
St. Francis Hospital, Poughkeepsie	1	45

	Retreats	Retreatants
Sacred Heart Academy, Rochester	4	389
St. Joseph's Hill Academy, Staten Island	1	75
Seminary of Our Lady, Stella Niagara	1	67
Our Lady of Mercy Academy, Syosset	1	35
St. Anthony's Convent, Syracuse	1	250
St. Joseph's Hospital, Syracuse	2	86
Marymount College, Tarrytown	3	395
House of Good Shepherd, Troy	1	167
Helpers of Holy Souls, Tuckahoe	2	61
St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Utica	1	51
Immaculate Heart Academy, Watertown	1	175
Good Counsel College, White Plains	1	285
St. Ann's Commercial School, Buffalo	1	128
Most Holy Rosary High School, Syracuse	1	285
St. Patrick's High School, Syracuse	1	270
St. Lucy's High School, Syracuse	1	175
Connecticut:		
Sacred Heart Academy, Noroton	2	122
Delaware:		
St. Francis Hospital, Wilmington	2	50
District of Columbia:		
Georgetown Visitation Convent, Washington	2	185
House of the Good Shepherd, Washington	1	97
Holy Trinity High School, Washington	1	148
Notre Dame Academy, Washington	1	408
Sacred Heart Academy, Washington	2	180
Washington Retreat House, Washington	1	19
Illinois:		
Cenacle, Warrenville	1	45
Maryland:		
Mercy Hospital, Baltimore	1	55
Mt. St. Agnes College, Baltimore	2	290
Visitation Academy, Frederick	1	60
St. Mary's Academy, Leonardtown	1	145
St. Frances Convent, Baltimore	1	152
Mt. Calvary, Forestville	1	78
Cardinal Gibbons Institute, Ridge	1	20
Massachusetts:		
Cenacle, Brighton	1	70
Catholic Alumni Sodality, Boston	1	700
Girls Catholic High School, Malden	1	230
St. Mary's High School, Melrose	1	110
Michigan:		
Mount Mary, Detroit	1	35

	Retreats	Retreatants
North Carolina:		
St. Genevieve of the Pines, Asheville	1	50
Pennsylvania:		
Mt. Aloysius Academy, Cresson	2	180
Dominican Retreat House, Elkins Park	1	20
Immaculata College, Immaculata	2	454
St. Joseph's Academy, McSherrystown	1	63
Assumption Academy, Germantown	1	60
House of the Good Shepherd, Philadelphia	1	293
St. Leonard's Academy, Philadelphia	1	74
College of Chestnut Hill, Chestnut Hill	1	260
Notre Dame Academy, Philadelphia	1	102
Sacred Heart Academy, Overbrook	4	345
Sacred Heart Academy, Torresdale	3	325
Rosemont College, Rosemont	1	123
Holy Child Academy, Sharon Hill	2	167
St. Ann's Academy, Wilkes-Barre	1	105
Our Lady of Angels, Glen Riddle	1	260
Little Sisters of Poor, Philadelphia	1	210
St. Michael's Shrine, Torresdale	1	52
St. Basil's Academy, Fox Chase	1	43
Holy Ghost Convent, Pittsburgh	1	15
Catholic Women's Club, York	1	31
Texas:		
Ursuline Academy, Galveston	1	175
Virginia:		
St. Francis de Sales High School, Rock Castle	1	106
West Virginia:		
St. Mary's Hospital, Huntington	2	69
Visitation Academy, Wheeling	3	157
Wheeling Hospital, Wheeling	1	81
St. Joseph's Villa, Fairmont	1	92
	177	21,230

SUMMARY

Diocesan Clergy	40	3,979
Seminarians	3	599
Orders of Men	64	2,499
Orders of Women	235	15,648
Laymen	205	23,637
Laywomen	177	21,230
	724	67,592

BY THE FATHERS OF THE MISSOURI PROVINCE

	Retreats	Retreatants
Jesuit Communities	9	650
Diocesan Clergy	13	718
Canons Regular of Holy Cross	1	31
Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate	1	45
Resurrectionists	1	50
Sacred Heart Fathers	1	8
Christian Brothers	2	307
Franciscan Brothers	1	25
Seminarians	2	335
	31	2,169

Orders of Women

Adorers of the Most Precious Blood	1	125
Blessed Sacrament Srs.	1	35
Cenacle	1	30
Charity (B.V.M.)	16	1,005
Charity (Leavenworth)	5	280
Charity (St. Augustine)	1	116
Dominicans	3	99
Franciscan Sisters, Daughters of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary	1	23
Franciscan Sisters of Penance and Christian Charity	1	50
Franciscan Sisters of St. Mary of the Third Order of St. Francis	1	90
Franciscan Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis	1	8
Good Shepherd	11	290
Helpers of the Holy Souls	2	42
Incarnate Word	1	87
Little Sisters of the Poor	1	20
Loretto Srs.	2	195
Mercy Srs.	22	1,315
Missionary Zelatrices of the Sacred Heart	2	48
Notre Dame Srs.	11	1,319
Oblate Srs. of Providence	1	26
Presentation Srs.	3	310
Religious of the Sacred Heart	14	539
Servants of Mary	2	113
Spanish Srs., Servants of Mary	2	101
St. Agnes	2	59
St. Joseph	12	1,574

	Retreats	Retreatants
Ursuline Srs.	10	391
Visitation Srs.	2	85
	132	8,375
Lay People		
Laymen	83	4,405
Laywomen	65	4,564
Nurses	19	875
Students	95	17,821
	262	27,665
SUMMARY		
Diocesian Clergy	13	718
Seminarians	2	335
Orders of Men	16	1,116
Orders of Women	132	8,375
Laymen	83	4,405
Laywomen	84	5,439
Students	95	17,821
	425	38,209

BY THE FATHERS OF THE NEW ENGLAND PROVINCE

Diocesan Clergy		
Antigonish, N. S.	1	154
At Auriesville	1	10
Boston	4	751
Portland	2	220
Springfield	2	450
Orders of Men		
Natick, R. I., Missionaries of the Sacred Heart	1	8
Valley Falls, R. I., Trappists	1	80
Seminarians		
Peabody, Xavierian Brothers	1	55
Tyngsboro, Marists	1	80
Brighton, Mass.	2	227
Bloomfield, Ct.	1	229
Orders of Women		
Cenacle, Brighton, Mass.	1	57
Charity, Wellesley Hills, Mass.	1	90
Charity, Baltic, Ct.	1	88

	Retreats	Retreatants
Charity of Nazareth, Newburyport, Mass.	1	42
Charity of Nazareth, Brockton, Mass.	1	52
Christian Education, Arlington, Mass.	1	20
Christian Education, Milton, Mass.	2	75
Congr. Notre Dame, Lewiston, Maine	1	20
Congr. Most Holy Redem., Danvers, Mass.	1	16
Daughters Heart of Mary, Burlington, Vt.	1	35
Faithful Comp. of Jesus, Fitchburg, Mass.	1	48
Faithful Comp. of Jesus, Providence, R. I.	2	75
Good Shepherd, Albany, N. Y.	1	17
Good Shepherd, Boston, Mass.	2	43
Good Shepherd, Peekskill, N. Y.	1	19
Good Shepherd, Providence, R. I.	1	16
Good Shepherd, Springfield, Mass.	1	15
Grey Nuns, Cambridge, Mass.	1	50
Holy Child Jesus, Melrose, Mass.	1	15
Mercy, Bridgeport, Ct.	1	35
Mercy, Burlington, Vt.	1	110
Mercy, Fall River, Mass.	3	265
Mercy, Greenwich, Ct.	1	12
Mercy, Hooksett, N. H.	1	150
Mercy, Hartford, Ct.	3	178
Mercy, Leicester, Mass.	1	85
Mercy, Manchester, N. H.	2	169
Mercy, Manville, R. I.	1	100
Mercy, Milford, Ct.	2	215
Mercy, New Bedford, Mass.	1	24
Mercy, New Haven, Ct.	1	41
Mercy, Portland, Me.	2	279
Mercy, So. Norwalk, Ct.	1	7
Mercy, Stamford, Ct.	1	17
Mercy, Waterbury, Ct.	1	21
Notre Dame Namur, Boston, Mass.	1	80
Notre Dame Namur, Chicopee, Mass.	1	18
Notre Dame Namur, Lawrence, Mass.	1	55
Notre Dame Namur, Springfield, Mass.	1	28
Notre Dame Namur, Tyngsboro, Mass.	1	199
Notre Dame Namur, Waltham, Mass.	2	183
Notre Dame Namur, Worcester, Mass.	2	251
Precious Blood, Portland, Maine	1	11
Providence, Holyoke, Mass.	4	484
Sacred Heart, Newton, Mass.	2	67
Sacred Heart, Providence, R. I.	2	57
St. Casimir, Newton, Pa.	1	50
St. Joseph, Brighton, Mass.	1	172
St. Joseph, Chicopee, Mass.	1	153

	Retreats	Retreatants
St. Joseph, Hartford, Ct.	1	130
St. Joseph, Holyoke, Mass.	2	457
St. Joseph, Springfield, Mass.	1	75
Union of Sacred Heart, Tall River, Mass.	1	190
St. Joseph, Weston, Mass.	1	83

Laywomen

Cenacle, Brighton, Mass.	16	1,032
Cenacle, Newport, R. I.	3	150
Cenacle, New York, N. Y.	1	80
Cenacle, Warrenville, Ill.	1	50
Charity, Baltic, Ct.	3	154
Charity, Wellesley Hills, Mass.	2	338
Christian Education, Arlington, Mass.	1	60
Daughters Heart of Mary, Burlington, Vt.	2	42
Franciscan, Chestnut Hill, Mass.	1	23
Grey Nuns, Manchester, N. H.	1	49
Grey Nuns, Lewiston, Me.	2	60
Mercy, Hartford, Ct.	1	150
Mercy, Hooksett, N. H.	2	200
Mercy, Manchester, N. H.	1	52
Mercy, Milford, Ct.	1	150
Mercy, Portland, Me.	2	175
Mercy, Stamford, Ct.	1	125
Notre Dame Namur, Boston, Mass.	3	420
Notre Dame Namur, Tyngsboro, Mass.	1	101
Providence, Portsmouth, N. H.	1	52
Sacred Heart, Newton, Mass.	1	150
Sacred Heart, Noroton, Ct.	1	9
Sacred Heart, Providence, R. I.	3	212
St. Casimir, Newton, Pa.	1	28
St. Francis, Niagara Falls, N. Y.	2	60
St. Joseph, Albany, N. Y.	1	150
St. Joseph, Albany, Charleston, W. Va.	2	50
St. Joseph, Chicopee, Mass.	2	211

Laymen

Boston College	4	1,950
Holy Cross College	3	1,400
Boston College High School	2	950
Fairfield College Preparatory School	1	325
Cranwell Preparatory School	1	115
Cheverus High School	1	250
St. John's Preparatory School	1	250
Canterbury School	1	102

	Retreats	Retreatants
St. Sebastian School	1	18
Sacred Heart, Providence	1	17
Campion Hall	45	1,498
Private	58	58

SUMMARY

Priests (Secular)	12	1,621
Religious Congregations (men)	4	223
Seminarians	3	556
Religious Women	72	5,244
Secular ladies and girl students	59	4,333
Students (boys) Colleges and High Schools..	16	5,377
Laymen	45	1,498
Private	58	58
	269	18,910